1959

Richard II on TV: A Critical Analysis Comparing the NBC Television Production with Shakespeare's Original Play

James A. Brown
Loyola University Chicago

RICHARD II ON TV: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS COMPARING THE NBC TELEVISION PRODUCTION WITH SHAKESPEARE'S ORIGINAL PLAY

by

James Anthony Brown, S.J.

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

June

1959

LIFE

James Anthony Brown was born in Cleveland, Ohio, May 10, 1932.

He was graduated from St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland, Ohio, June, 1950, and entered the Society of Jesus at Milford, Ohio, in August, 1950. He was graduated from Loyola University, Chicago, June, 1955, with the degree of Bachelor of Arts; he began his graduate studies at Loyola University in September, 1955. During the summer of 1957 and the academic year of 1957-1958 he held the position of teaching fellow at the University of Detroit, Michigan, where he took undergraduate courses in radio and television, and taught courses in radio and television announcing, and in the fundamentals (an introductory survey) of these media.

From 1948 to 1950 the author served as a radio announcer for the Cleveland Board of Education's station, WBOE-FM. During the course of philosophy and graduate studies at West Baden College of Loyola University, he produced an adaptation of Boswell's Life of Samuel Johnson which was broadcast over Cleveland's educational station, WBOE-FM, Chicago's Board of Education radio station, WBEZ-FM, and the University of Indiana's educational radio station, WFIU-FM. While at the University of Detroit in 1957 and 1958 he served as a staff member of the University's studios in the

Detroit Educational Television Foundation's television station, WTVS-TV; he produced and directed an eighty-six program series of telecourses in World History (courses offered on television, for full college credit), as well as directing and/or producing some twenty other television productions. He presented a fifteen-week series of college orientation and interview programs, "This Week On Campus," which he produced and on which he appeared as host. During this same period he lectured occasionally in the Department of English on Shakespeare and the Elizabethan stage. In the summer of 1958 he lectured at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, on the subject of educational television. In the fall of 1958 he began his doctoral studies in communications at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, where he also lectured periodically in the Department of Telecommunications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to the many individuals and agencies who inspired, and assisted in providing the materials for, the present study. Special thanks are due to Rev. Herbert J. Ryan, S.J. for his painstaking precision in preparing an annotated copy of the television production script of Richard II; to Mildred Freed Alberg (and her Milberg Productions, Inc.), who made the original television script available and who graciously corresponded with the author regarding the script and the production; to the Hallmark Greeting Card Company, sponsors of the Hallmark Hall of Fame, and to the National Broadcasting Company, Inc.--Television, as well as to Mr. Maurice Evans and the cast, staff, and crews, who (with the sanction of their respective professional unions) gratuitously released the kinescope film recording of the television presentation for educational purposes.

To these and to the many others who encouraged and assisted the author in his work, he gratefully extends his thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

William Shakespeare is the world's playwright. Through the centuries his dramas have been produced in theaters around the globe. In the nineteen-hundred-and-fifties his plays are now being presented through the newest medium of mass communication, television.

The question arises: can Shakespeare's plays be presented effectively, in their integrity, through this new medium of the "electronic theater"? Will Shakespearean drama enrich television; or, on the contrary, must Shakespearean drama be modified, distorted, and even polluted by the medium's artistic restrictions and technical limitations? This is the question proposed for investigation in this thesis. The question is an important one for contemporary Shakespearean study and production, just as it is important for assessing the true potentiality of television as a medium for presentation of significant dramatic work. At the same time, the question has vast scope which involves many elements. Hence the present thesis restricts itself to the study of a single television adaptation of a specific drama by Shakespeare, King Richard II. The present analysis is a study of television's effect upon,

and success with, this classic Elizabethan drama as actually adapted for the electronic medium.

This thesis does not pretend to be a study of the theory of drama, nor even of Shakespeare's drama in general. Nor does it intend to be an exhaustive study of the elaborate technicalities of the television industry (such a study is proper to a Communication Arts Department, not to a Department of English).

This thesis is, rather, a comparative study of Shakespeare's King Richard II and of Maurice Evans' (1954) television adaptation of the play. The problem of the thesis is to analyze how Evans adapted this particular Elizabethan drama to the modern medium of television, and to determine to what extent he was successful or unsuccessful--where and in what aspects his presentation achieved what Shakespeare was after in the play. Answers to the following questions will be sought: What did Evans and his company do with the original text of Richard II in adapting it to meet the demands of the camera lens and the twenty-one-inch television screen? Did his adaptation preserve the integrity of plot and character portrayal of the original? Did his production of Shakespeare benefit by, or suffer from, the technical requirements and facilities of television?

This analysis of a specific television production of Shakespeare will provide one step towards evaluating the effectiveness of the television medium in producing Elizabethan drama (and, by extension, in producing any type of dramatic work on television).

Such a study will help to evaluate the potentiality of television for creative dramatic work, by pointing out some of the medium's advantages and limitations; implicitly at least, it will supply directives for future productions--what to avoid, what to repeat, and where and how to improve the art of drama on television, with reference to Shakespearean drama especially.

Chapter II considers the original play itself in order to determine the main lines of the plot, characterizations, and staging. In the chapter are considered the basic points of Shakespeare's Richard II, as agreed upon by the standard critics and commentators. Chapter III provides a summary investigation of the medium of television in so far as it affects the production of dramatic material. In Chapter IV the two previous chapters are fused, in order to analyze in detail the television production of Richard II according to the four points covered in Chapter II. The final chapter, Chapter V, offers a concluding summary of this present investigation, by evaluating the integrity and effectiveness of this particular Shakespearean drama in the medium of television.

The appendixes provide: (a) a summary of the scholars' conclusions about Elizabethan theater structure, appearance, and facilities; (b) a glossary of basic television production terminology used in the course of this study; and (c) a description of the specific procedure involved in assembling the materials for this thesis.

CHAPTER II

SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD II

The foundation for the present study may be established by determining the important characteristics of Shakespeare's original Richard II--namely (1) the basic plot, (2) the characters involved and their dramatic portrayal, (3) the dramatic expression (that is, the overall flow of action through the several acts and scenes, together with the lyric poetical qualities of the speeches), and (4) the important conventions of Elizabethan stage production which would have influenced the writing and presentation of the play as originally conceived by Shakespeare.

These four elements--what we may call the "meaning" of the play, and the means used in the original to achieve this meaning--may be determined by consulting the reliable Shakespearean authorities. The present thesis chapter does not attempt to construct a new theory of the play or of the various characters; it wishes only to establish the essential elements of the play as agreed upon by the major critics. Such a consensus can be obtained by prescinding from the various critics' minor individual particularities, so as to extract a generally accepted, overall analysis of Richard II. This will provide a key to what the play is and means, and to how

this meaning was achieved dramatically through character and action and staging.

An important criterion for the acceptance or rejection of a critic's opinion will be the "playability" of the opinion. For purposes of the present study, a critic's interpretation will be disregarded when it is such as becomes intelligible only after an exhaustive scientific analysis of minute details or of subtle (not to say vague) undercurrents of hypothetical implications and ambiguities. Thus the criterion for selection of critical commentary will be: would its intelligibility be possible from the stage action or does it require further explanation, even by means of a footnote?[1] The present study is concerned with Shakespeare's dramatic work of Richard II, as adapted for the "electronic stage" in this specific television production. Therefore, while history, philosophy, and psychology have an important role in this drama, the present study cannot concern itself with these more remote and elusive philosophical and politico-scientific aspects that may or may not underlie the play. Although these may be legitimate fields of investigation for the English scholar, they are not germane to the present thesis. The present investigation necessarily concerns itself with the interpretation of Shakespeare's Richard II not as s

---

[1]For example, Stanislavski is said to have remarked of Craig's interpretation of the nunnery scene in Hamlet that this elaborate theory would have to be explained in the program. So, it seems, would many critical opinions on interpretation of a work like King Richard II. (For this observation the author is indebted to Rev. Thomas E. Porter, S.J.)

piece of literature restricted to private reading and speculation, but as a drama influenced by the stagecraft which assisted and partially determined Shakespeare's shaping of his work.[2]

King Richard II is a drama based on the historical episode of the dethroning of a king. The king was Richard of Bordeaux; his throne was usurped in 1399 by Henry Duke of Hereford, called Bolingbroke (and he will be called Bolingbroke throughout the course of this study). In his dramatic recounting of the dethroning of Richard how did Shakespeare present the episode?

There is obviously a fugue-like theme running through the play--the political action of the usurper, set off against the deeper, more delicate simultaneous action of human personalities in conflict. E. K. Chambers acknowledges the political aspect of the conflict "since the play is, primarily, a study in kingship"; but he adds immediately: "beyond that, it has its personal aspect, since, even more fundamentally, the play is a study in human nature, and sets in opposition the two types of personality between which, from the beginning, the inheritance of this world has been divided."[3]

---

[2]Cf. Granville-Barker's well reasoned remarks on this point, "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, ed. Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 83-87: "Shakespeare . . . wrote and thought dramatically and has given us not merely plays in poetic form but something that is fundamentally and essentially poetic drama. . . . [O]nly in the theatre . . . will they be fully alive."

[3]Edmund K. Chambers, Shakespeare: A Survey (Cambridge, 1926), p. 89. This work will be referred to hereafter as Survey.

Chambers emphasizes this strictly dramatic end to which every element in the play (political, historical, philosophical, lyric) is subordinated. The playwright's intent was to throw into powerful relief the two principal characters of Richard and Bolingbroke. But primarily, the tragedy is intimately involved with Richard's character; the political fact of the deposition serves as the occasion, and as the vehicle, for the portrayal of the fluctuating, hypersensitive dual personality of Richard the king and of Richard the man. While Shakespeare's material for this play closely parallels Marlowe's type of material for his Edward II, Shakespeare's treatment differs from Marlowe's in that it goes beyond the presentation of the historical elements of the plot in order to create a tragedy of character. Shakespeare "had to go inside his hero for the real antagonist" rather than depend upon an external antagonist (granting that Bolingbroke comes closest to that role). For "Richard II is overcome not by external forces but by what he himself was. His character is his fate. The essential tragedy is brought about by the mere action of his mind upon itself, for he is a sentimentalist, self-defeated, though still a king in nature, feelings, and trappings."[4] The theme of the play, says Craig, is embodied in the character of Richard. He is overthrown by his enjoyment of his own emotions and by his refusal to see the world as it really is.[5]

---

[4]Hardin Craig, An Interpretation of Shakespeare (New York, 1948), p. 125. This work will be referred to as Interpretation.

[5]Ibid., p. 134.

Mark Van Doren echoes these views of the play: "The play is organized about a hero who, more indeed than contenting himself with a role of minor poet, luxuriates in it. His theme is himself. He dramatizes his grief. He spends himself in his poetry--which is something he loves more than power and more than any other person. His self-love is grounded upon an infatuation with the art he so proudly and self-consciously practices. That is what 'Richard II' is about, and what even its plot expresses. Its unity therefore is distinctive and impressive."[6] Edwin R. Hunter is quite outspoken in his analysis of the play's intent and purpose. He speaks of "the melodrama of King Richard II" and warns that to take the play with too serious political or ethical implications is to go beyond what Shakespeare intended--namely, to provide a moving drama by sketching a weak Richard who is much more impressive in word and gesture (even to the point of grotesqueness) than in act.[7] To Hunter, Richard II is interesting only because it portrays a man who pulls out the stops of oral lamentation for personal woe; the play is not important as the portrayal of a political or social conflict.

Thus it is conceded that Shakespeare did not attempt to present his own solution to the question of deposition; he was more

---

[6]Mark Van Doren, Shakespeare (New York, 1947), p. 89. These comments will be further substantiated when citation is made of specific manifestations of Richard's character throughout the play.

[7]Edwin R. Hunter, Shakspere [sic] and Common Sense (Boston, 1954), pp. 8, 32-33.

concerned with the dramatic portrayal of the compound king-man character of Richard (and its contrast with the silently powerful character of Bolingbroke).[8] Richard is the pivot around which the entire play turns. Even though his period of tyranny (in the first two acts) alienates the sympathies of the audience, still, from the moment that his fortunes begin to decline (in the third act), these sympathies are gradually won to his side--not so much out of admiration as out of pity. Goodman outlines the rising and falling action of the entire tragedy: "the chief discovery occurs in Act III, scene 2, when Richard finds himself deserted and powerless and his enemy powerful. The consequent reversal is verbally marked in the following scene when Richard cries, 'Down, down I come; like glistering Phaeton.' (It is characteristic of Richard that he verbally deposes himself ahead of the action.) The full-blown reversal is the deposition, a scene of passion, extremely pitiful." That it is Richard who occupies the center-stage in this tragedy is evident from the fact that his character is so fully and carefully sketched. Bolingbroke's character, on the other hand, is never really completed; it remains enigmatic even at the play's close. "In Richard's plot he [Richard] comes to realize his historical error [his weakness of character and consequent failure as king], and his personal action can come to a close. But Henry has not yet grown to this realization [of his own character and of his

---

[8]Cf. Craig, Interpretation, pp. 125, 135; Chambers, Survey, p. 93.

historical error of usurpation]--not perhaps until II Henry (IV.4). By the end of Richard II there is a certain completeness in Richard's personality, but not in Henry's. The resolution is partial."[9]

Richard does not actually oppose Bolingbroke in a struggle to prevent the deposition, as one would expect between protagonist and antagonist. Rather, Richard's own character dooms him, and prevents him from struggling. Richard defeats himself. From the action and from the language (both of which shall be investigated presently), one learns Shakespeare's intent to present the tragedy of Richard II "from the inside rather than from the outside."[10] This involves a preoccupation of the dramatist (and therefore of the drama itself) with the portrayal of character rather than with the re-creating of actions which emphasize merely political and historical elements.

That this was Shakespeare's intent in Richard II is borne out by a study of the play's development through the five acts. The commentaries of the critics will continue to serve as guides to the authentic meaning of the plot and character-development. But Hardin Craig's reminder is apropos at this point: "Shakespeare's own meanings are much the most significant meanings for his plays as wholes and for passages, scenes, and characters within them. To

---

[9]Paul Goodman, "Philosophic Thought in Richard II," The Structure of Literature, pp. 60,62.

[10]Cf. Hardin Craig, An Introduction to Shakespeare: Eight Plays, Selected Sonnets (Chicago, 1952), pp. 114-115. This work will be referred to as Introduction.

occupy such a ground is, frankly, to attempt to see with Shakespeare's eyes and to know that those eyes were the eyes of an Elizabethan. This requires imaginative insight as well as knowledge, and these things the author of this book does not attribute to himself in any transcendent measure. He can plead only his study, his long experience, and his modest success."[11] This is true for each of the critics; in their many points of agreement there can be found a common basic understanding which approaches as nearly as possible an authentic interpretation of what Shakespeare meant and how he meant to portray it on the stage.[12]

The play itself opens in a room in the palace in London. "Shakespeare gets the necessary political groundwork done with as quickly as possible and settles down, as we do, to the fascination of watching character in action."[13] The historical situation was already perfectly familiar to Shakespeare's audience, so that he needed to do little more than allude to it in establishing the personal and political motives in the first scene.[14] Richard does not enter the play by plunging into action. On the contrary,

---

[11]Craig, Interpretation, p. v.

[12]Craig himself seems to depart most from the average line of criticism; admittedly his work is an interpretation rather than a strict commentary or critical analysis. He is concerned with the philosophical implications, and with sidelights that sometime seem to run deeper than Shakespeare could have had in mind for his Elizabethan audience who looked on from the theater pit and galleries.

[13]Margaret Webster, Shakespeare Without Tears, 2nd (revised) ed. (Cleveland, 1955), p. 177.

[14]Cf. Craig, Interpretation, p. 126

throughout the first act he displays himself only as glittering, arrogant, reckless, and irresponsible, with little depth or power of character adapted to vigorous action. After the first scene in Act II, he is absent from the stage for four entire scenes. He does not begin to take command of the play until the third act where he returns from Ireland to Wales and subsequently divests himself of his kingship. Only then does Shakespeare directly fill in the portrayal of the vacillating, sentimental character of Richard who will from that point command the entire stage for the remainder of the play. Until the mid-point of the drama, the play must be carried along for much of the time by the impetus supplied from its lesser characters; and yet Richard is indirectly the dominant character around whom the wheel of events revolves. "Shakespeare has supplied the necessary material [on which the actor can build the part of Richard in the latter part of the play]. Even while the protagonist is off the stage, he [Shakespeare] has, most subtly, continued to build and change the character of Richard by reflection and indirection; he has suggested and prepared the poet and the man who will pass, before our eyes, through all the ordeals of suffering."[15] Travis Bogard comments that in the initial act there is not enough of Richard portrayed to anticipate firmly the shallowness of his character as revealed in the second act; explicit clarification of the precise nature of his character is absent

---

[15]Webster, p. 169.

until the third act. "Richard has not, as a person, entered the action in any vital way, nor has the play achieved force and point. There have been great speeches, but the listless action has not embraced them in a truly dramatic design. . . . On Richard's return from Ireland, the essential drama begins, for it is at this point that Richard enters on his way of suffering, and it is here that the conflict between Richard and Bolingbroke emerges. Now action begins to generate."[16]

In Act I.i Richard's character is tentatively sketched as that of a man who is dignified and courteous, friendly but not familiar, and who has about him an air of complaint and unbusiness-like habits; he possesses "a high sense of the outward dignity of kingship without either moral rectitude or force of character."[17] This is evidenced in Richard's dealings with Bolingbroke and Mowbray, both of whom possess an initiative, vigor, and straightforwardness foreign to the king. The opening action of the play is typically verbal and involves these latter two forceful characters. Richard stands on the sidelines while they swing immediately into the thrust and lunge of oral conflict. These two men, with the various elements of the kingdom behind them, represent the great powers which when combined will occasion Richard's withdrawal

---

[16]Travis Bogard, "Shakespeare's Second Richard," PMLA, LXX (March 1955), 192-209.

[17]Cyril Ransome, Short Studies of Shakespeare's Plots (London, 1890), pp. 164-167.

from his royal position.

In Act I.ii Shakespeare "who wished to impress on the audience the fact of Richard's guilt, and the enormity of the murder of a relative, uses the mouth of the duchess to paint the full horror of the deed. Nor are there any of the audience allowed to remain in doubt for a moment as to who is its author."[18] Richard's character is indelibly blackened by this scene.

The third scene points up the fickle arbitrariness of Richard; here at the lists of Coventry he indirectly provides for the combining of the two forces which will eventually return to oppose him. In a shallow show of royal authority Richard, at the crucial moment, capriciously halts the previously ordered combat between Bolingbroke and Mowbray. The King arbitrarily sentences Mowbray to lifelong exile and Bolingbroke to ten years' banishment (which is casually reduced to six years a moment later). In the same breath Richard speaks vainly of "the "unstooping firmness of my upright soul" and legislates that "after our sentence, plaining comes too late"--a feeble attempt to display strength and determination at the very moment when he has wavered and displayed weakness of decision.[19] Richard as King is growing despicable in the eyes of all observers; "both combatants underscore the growing feeling against him."[20] As G. G. Gervinus notes, this throwing down of his warder

---

[18] Ibid., p. 168.

[19] Cf. ibid., pp. 169-171.

[20] Webster, p. 170.

was the beginning of all Richard's subsequent troubles. This is the one event chosen by Shakespeare for greater dramatic prominence "beyond the scattered touches and the insinuations which denote the inability of the king, and his wavering between unseasonable power and weakness." Further, "it serves essentially to place in opposition to each other, in their first decisive collision, the two main characters, Richard and Bolingbroke."[21]

Act I.iv presents Aumerle with his satirical description of the parting between himself and Bolingbroke, and Richard who displays his true feelings about the man he had exiled with the "mock sorrow and the oily phrase"[22] of "Six frozen winters spent/ Return with welcome home from banishment" (I.iii.206-207). For Richard points out how:

> Ourself . . . . . .
> Observed his courtship to the common people;--
> How he did seem to dive into their hearts,
> With humble and familiar courtesy;
> . . . . . .
> As were our England in reversion his,
> And he our subjects' next degree in hope. (I.iv.23-26,35-36)

Richard is not unaware of Bolingbroke's potential as a royal successor.

In Act II.i, John of Gaunt pinpoints the issue when he glorifies England and decries Richard's shoddy ruling of the realm. Richard, in flouting the patriotic and patriarchal Gaunt, is

---

[21]G. G. Gervinus, Shakespeare Commentaries, 2nd (revised) ed., trans. F. E. Bunnett (London, 1875), p. 284.

[22]Ransome, p. 172.

scorning England itself. The die is here cast with regard to Richard's royal character (or lack of it): as a king he is a failure. In his vanity he flies into a rage when the power of Gaunt's eloquence forces him to wrench himself from his dreamy ideal world of imagination and to look at himself as the unjust and degenerate king that he is.[23] Gaunt's death does not move the King to take seriously the old man's final statements; rather, Richard confiscates his property and dismisses the whole affair. Further evidence of Richard's overweening caprice is his reaction to York's warning of what evil may come of all this; the King hears York say:

> I'll not be by the while: my liege, farewell:
> What will ensue hereof, there's none can tell;
> But by bad courses may be understood,
> That their events can never fall out good. (II.i.211-214)

Upon hearing this condemning complaint of York, Richard "appoints him next moment regent of the kingdom during his own absence in Ireland, and so saying, gaily leaves the stage with the queen and his favourites."[24]

Events begin to take shape from this moment of the play. The nobles gather after Richard's departure, and in their excited words echo the feeling throughout the realm, of noble and commoner alike: England is suffering because the King is governed by flatterers and traitors. This continued respect for the King himself--while

---

[23]Cf. Webster, p. 171; Craig, Interpretation, p. 129; Craig, Introduction, p. 115; Ransome, pp. 176-177.

[24]Ransome, p. 178.

casting blame on other sources as the cause of the troubles--adds a cloak of justifiability to the gathering storm.

Act II.ii brings indirect accounts of the progress of the movement throughout the land. Here, too, Richard's character begins to take on a new aspect.

> So far the impressions we have received of Richard's character have been wholly bad. We have seen him at once weak, frivolous, spendthrift, unscrupulous, cunning, and impolitic. Had he no good side? Shakespeare answers that he has, and in Act ii, Scene 2 he begins the process of building up in his audience a new feeling of pity for the erring king. The first step towards this is to excite pity for the innocent queen. In her mouth he is 'sweet Richard,' a man capable of inspiring a tender passion; and it is by the forebodings of this lady that the chord of pity is first touched.[25]

The doom of Richard the King is already certain; here Shakespeare brings up the question: what of Richard himself, as a man? This question is heightened during the present four scenes, and the entire play begins to take on a new perspective. In II.ii Richard is portrayed by indirection through the Queen who, disturbed by misgivings, is filled with grief and longing for him; through his shallow friends who run at the first hint of danger; through his uncle York who knows where the right lies. In II.iii York wavers in his loyalties and solves the dilemma in a Richard-like way by remaining "neuter," which comes to the same as a reluctant acquiescence to something he is powerless to prevent.[26] Bolingbroke himself, purposeful and politely prosaic, claims that he has

---

[25] Ibid., p. 180.

[26] Webster, pp. 171-172.

returned solely to restore the forfeited estates which are his by law. That he ambitions more is not immediately evident. But as he marches forward, more and more of discontented England join his forces. More than a private estate is at stake. He avows that he also intends to purge away the traitors of the commonwealth; in Bolingbroke's mind, as in the minds of many of the English, this may well include King Richard himself.

In Act II.iv, Salisbury, still faithful to Richard, finds his assembled Welsh forces crumbling with the King's delay. This brief scene prepares the way for the shift in character and action of Richard, through one of the few loyal nobles, who sets the emotional key and sounds the very melody of Richard's return with his:

> Ah, Richard, with the eyes of heavy mind,
> I see thy glory, like a shooting star,
> Fall to the base earth from the firmament.
> Thy sun sets weeping in the lowly West,
> Witnessing storms to come, woe, and unrest;
> Thy friends are fled to wait upon thy foes,
> And crossly to thy good all fortune goes. (II.iv.18-24)

"Without once bringing Richard on the stage, Shakespeare has entirely shifted the weight of our sympathy; his friends are ours, his enemies we cannot warm to; it is now for Richard alone to capture our hearts and the play; and he does so, with the armory of weakness, the gentleness of defeat, and the pure gold of the poetry in which he speaks."[27]

Richard--his complex character--is undoubtedly the center of

---

[27] Ibid.

this drama; it is at this point (II.iv and III.i) that he begins to become the focal point of the play in his weakness, defeat, and lyric sensitivity. The audience cannot admire him as a king; but it can pity him as a wretched man. The tragedy is entirely Richard's. The play is concerned with him as king only as a necessary requirement for watching him as a man and poet. It is as the latter that Richard takes command of the drama.

Act III.i finds Bolingbroke exercising the function of ruler; although not king de jure he is king de facto. In his dignity and vigorous, determined action there are mirrored by reverse reflection the opposite qualities of the still absent Richard. Bolingbroke, further, is polite and thoughtful with regard to Richard and the Queen, and he is reserved and circumspect in stating his own purpose in returning to England. This is one of the scenes which renders difficult an understanding of the characterization of Bolingbroke; he is here either forthright and sincere, or else he is the most subtle and hypocritical of usurpers. He is either seeking only what is rightfully his and no more; or else he is all the while secretly contriving, his strategy being to smother all possible objections by gently proposing his "legal rights." His character, at least as manifested in his stated purpose, is still unresolved. At the same time, from this point on, the character of Richard will grow deeper and more definite (as the poet who of his own accord foregoes kingship at the mere hint of opposition). Ransome says simply: "This scene [III.i] concludes the first part

of the play."[28] Well it might, for with Bolingbroke's landing comes the manifestation of Richard's highly sensitive, poetic character "which was before obscured in prosperity and mirth, but which even now is accompanied by weakness and want of stability, the distinguishing feature of his character. . . . [A]t the first moment of misfortune he falls past recovery."[29]

Act III.ii presents Richard in his last moments as king--even though in fact he retains his official royal title until the fourth act of the play. In this second scene of Act III, he glories in the realm of which he is the ruler. He considers it not so much in itself but as an extension of himself--which is another manifestation of his vanity. "Of course he loves England, but he loves it as an appendage to himself."[30] He is so wholly preoccupied with his invincibility as England's king and God's vicegerent, that Aumerle and the Bishop of Carlisle have difficulty in making him understand that there is something wrong. Sensitive and sentimental as he is, Richard reacts quickly and to the extreme when once he learns of the defection of his subjects. He depends upon his close loyal followers, his lifelong props, to encourage him. When they do encourage him, he scales the heights of poetic fancy and fairly sings out his words of denunciation for those who have left

---

[28]Ransome, p. 183.

[29]Gervinus, p. 290.

[30]Craig, Interpretation, p. 130.

him; and he is thoroughly taken up with extolling his own regal position as king. However, further news of traitorous cleavage among his subjects crushes Richard's poetic sense and he plummets to despair. This is his character. He falls past recovery. With a second message of new evil he is submissive, ready for abdication and death. The word of York's alliance with Bolingbroke causes Richard to curse his cousin Aumerle "for having led him forth 'of that sweet way he was in to despair'; he renounces every comfort, every act; he orders his troops discharged; capable of no further effort he will be reminded of none, and himself removes every temptation to it. A highly poetic brilliancy is cast upon the scenes of humiliation and ruin . . . and the pleasure-loving man now finds enjoyment in suffering and sorrow, and a sweetness in despair."[31] Richard resolves to "pine away in Flint Castle"; he abandons his realm, his throne, his character as a king. There is now left for the remainder of the drama the development and expression of his character as a man.

Act III.iii, before Flint Castle, brings Richard to the battlement for the interview with Northumberland. After a brief show of power (in "a paroxysm of his kingly fancy"[32]), Richard himself is the first to speak of the subjection of the king. Then his imagination runs almost to the borders of insanity as he fashions

---

[31]Gervinus, pp. 290-291; cf. Craig, Introduction, p. 115; Craig, Interpretation, p. 132; Ransome, pp. 184-185.

[32]Gervinus, p. 291.

poetic analogies and plays on words, once again luxuriating in his grief and despair. Finally, after he has exhausted the possibilities of poetic imagery, he descends to meet Bolingbroke outside the walls of the castle. Richard almost gratuitously plays into Bolingbroke's hand and offers to resign the crown.

Bolingbroke's attitude at this point of the play is difficult to ascertain. Once again the question is raised: is Bolingbroke sincerely humble or is he subtly calculating, actually leading Richard as one would an unwary opponent's chessman right to the spot where he wants him? Clark and Wright point out the sources that Shakespeare used for this part of the episode. In the "Metrical History" Bolingbroke tells Richard he has not ruled well and that he, Bolingbroke (all the time kneeling), will help Richard rule as he should. On the other hand, Holinshed described Bolingbroke as outwardly (at least) humble, subjecting himself to Richard and asking only for restitution of what is properly his. "Shakespeare's version of the scene appears to lie between the two extremes of Bolingbroke's defiance, as recorded by the French knight, and copied by Stowe; and of his assumed humility, as described by Holinshed."[33] Craig interprets the scene: "Bolingbroke, having got a taste of power, insists that the resignation shall be ceremonious," which implies a calculating determination on the part

---

[33]William George Clark and W. A. Wright, The Complete Works of William Shakespeare: Stage Edition with a Life, Variorum, Plots, Indices, XV (Philadelphia, n.d.), p. 275.

of Bolingbroke. Ransome follows this opinion at a distance, with some qualifications: "Bolingbroke, though studiously observant of all outward respect and courtesy, cannot help showing the masterfulness of one who feels that the future development of the situation is in his hands. As yet, however, he carefully avoids a larger claim than to the restoration of his hereditary lands."[34] Bolingbroke has so far asked only for what he claims is his by right. Richard, at this slight demonstration of opposition (and with his knowledge of the loss of most of his own forces), feels that his position as king has not only been shaken but irrevocably undermined. It is he who actually takes the initiative in making the base surrender of the crown to Bolingbroke. In keeping with his highly emotional and imaginative character, Richard "prefers to act the part of a dethroned ruler deserted and betrayed like the Saviour, to whom he freely compares himself [in IV.i]. He throws away every chance he has, big and little, and the abdication scene is a marvel of character depiction."[35]

But before the deposition scene there comes a short scene with the Queen and the gardeners. The critics agree that this is an allegorical statement of the political and philosophical theme of

---

[34]Craig, Interpretation, p. 132; Ransome, p. 187. It may be noted that Bolingbroke's ultimate purpose seems manifested in Northumberland's omission of Richard's royal title in addressing him; York, on the other hand, corrects Northumberland, and so may still be unaware of any further political designs by Bolingbroke.

[35]Craig, Introduction, p. 115.

the entire play. The scene is said to re-assert the ideal of the state as Eden; it portrays the possibility of the creation of such an ideal by an Adam-like king who establishes "law and form and due proportion" within the "sea-walled garden" of England. This scene, therefore, besides offering a change of dramatic pace and supplying the time interval appropriate for Richard's journey to Westminster for the formal abdication, also brings out the deeper significance of the action in the drama. In so far as it clarifies the political issue it is an important scene dramatically, since the fall of the King is the occasion for the expression of the character of the man. But as a statement of what might be Shakespeare's own views on the subject (i.e., his advocating democratic rule, as Craig interprets the scene)--this does not concern the present study.[36] The important point, dramatically, is that this scene epitomizes the tragedy that is King Richard's; he has ruled poorly, and the results have been disastrous for himself, for his friends (as reflected in the grief of the Queen and in the wistful melancholy of the gardener), and for the realm (as implied in the gardener's allegorical comments).

Act IV opens with the deposition of Richard in Westminster Abbey. Here the two major characters are played dramatically one against the other. Nowhere in the play does the contrast stand out

---

[36]Cf. Leonard F. Dean, "Richard II: the State and the Image of the Theatre," PMLA, LXVII (March 1952), 211-218; Craig, Interpretation, p. 135; Ransome, pp. 188-190; Harlod C. Goddard, The Meaning of Shakespeare (Chicago, 1951), pp. 159-160.

so clearly. The scene is moulded perfectly to Richard's taste. He rises to the occasion by displaying his magniloquent language; he fashions metaphors expressive of his outraged royal person. Bolingbroke is all the while silent or, when he does speak, quite prosaic in his few words. Craig looks upon him as biding his time until the formalities are completed, patient only as long as necessary to humor the poetizing monarch.[37] Bolingbroke has throughout the play been sketched only in rough outline. And, except for the first scenes, he has stood in a commanding position of firm control; he evokes, and needs, little sympathy. The rest of his character (including his true motives in the present line of action) remains but hinted at, so that one is not compelled to admire him. Because of this calculated coldness on the part of the usurper, "for some odd reason, in spite of constant and interwoven folly, one likes Richard better than one likes Bolingbroke."[38] The reason, of course, lies precisely in this folly; it is typical of Richard's

---

[37]Cf. Craig, Interpretation, pp. 132-133.

[38]Ibid., p. 134; cf. Goddard, p. 157. But cf. the following comments of Ransome, p. 191:

"The remainder of Act iv. is occupied with a representation of the deposition, and it is not one upon which we can with much satisfaction dilate. No material advance is made in our knowledge of the character either of Richard or of Bolingbroke. The one is as fantastic, emotional, and ineffective as the other is practical, cold, and immovable. There is more in Richard's speech to call out our contempt than to provoke our pity. His utter want of control over his emotions strikes us as un-English and effeminate. . . . We feel it a relief when Richard's departure for the Tower brings the scene to a close."

character in whatever activity he undertakes. It is the pity which he evokes that wins sympathy for him.

According to Clark and Wright, Shakespeare is concerned throughout the scene with the unhappy man who is being forced to hand over his crown to another. The playwright shows us "the vacillations of a nature irresolute and yielding, but clinging to the phantom of power when the substance had passed away." Hunter, quoting Stopford A. Brooke, speaks of "that spectacular scene with the mirror which is quite unnecessary" and which "worst of all . . . lowers our pity for Richard because it exhibits his theatrical folly in public." Goddard, on the other hand, holds that Shakespeare's overall purpose in these closing scenes is to increase the audience's sympathy and pity for the uncrowned king:

> With Richard's deposition our sympathy shifts. Now he is the underdog. Now we see the Queen's 'fair rose' wither, hear of the dust and rubbish that a fickle populace cast from windows on his head after roaring applause at the sight of his successor. But it is not just pity that we feel. Our respect for Richard rises also, for, uncrowned, he is free to be a man instead of a king. . . . He learns through suffering, and though much of what he says is still vitiated by self-pity, he foresees, like Carlisle, the trouble in store for England and the house of Lancaster.

Ransome agrees that the first scene of Act V is introduced by Shakespeare "mainly to show how Richard, deprived of his crown, has become, even to the eyes of those most intimate with him, a changed man." He is utterly impotent now. Even his wife's appeal to him to bear himself as the lion-like monarch he should be fails to move him. He speaks in hushed tones. Yet, he tells her how she shall make guests weep with the sad story of his life and death;

he still cannot refrain from luxuriating in his own sorrows.[39]

Act V.ii "advances the plot by explaining the pretext on which the usurping king decides on the death of his rival; but its real importance lies in the light it throws on the character of York. York is weak but loyal; true to Richard so long as Richard is true to himself"[40]--but when Richard has resigned the crown to another, York's allegiance lies with the newly crowned king.

In V.iii Bolingbroke's forgiving nature is made manifest; Aumerle renounces his former complicity in the plot against Bolingbroke's life. The action in this scene is said to supply much of the pretext for the inferences in the scene following (V.iv).

By inference in V.iv, Bolingbroke's desire (and even decision?) to do away with Richard is made known. As long as he is alive Richard will have his loyal divine-rightist faction who will strive to replace Bolingbroke the usurper with the rightful "God-annointed" Richard. To put down this living threat to his new-found royalty, Bolingbroke would logically want Richard put out of the way. That Bolingbroke explicitly orders this action, however, is not at all clear from V.iv which relies entirely upon Exton's reconstruction and understanding of Bolingbroke's cryptic comments.

With V.v Richard reaches a climax in his ineffectual

---

[39]Clark and Wright, XV, 277; Hunter, p. 34, quoting Stopford A. Brooke, On Ten Plays of Shakespeare, pp. 91-95--Travis Bogard is directly opposed to this excessive statement, PMLA, LXX, 198; cf. Goddard, p. 157; Ransome, pp. 191-192.

[40]Cf. Ransome, pp. 191-192.

attitudinizing. But his reflections are more than merely sentimental in this his final scene. Although he is occupied with forming clever, poetic ways of picturing his woes (even cataloguing them), still his character as a man grows. The playwright reminds the audience of Richard's amiable characteristics by introducing the poor groom whose honest emotion recalls the love of the Queen for her King-husband. The scene rushes to a close with the keeper's entry, Richard's mounting irritation, and "the lightning bolt of passion in which the scene ends" as Richard kills two of his assasins before being himself struck down.

What was the nature of this passion? Again, the critics are divided.[41] Goddard insists that this ultimate act of Richard is no such thing as bravery or a final burst of courage from a coward; "it is just the reflex action of a man without self-control in the presence of death, as little willed as the galvanic twitching of a frog's leg. It is a fury of desperation pure and simple, a particularly ignominious and ironic end for a king who pretended to believe that everything from stones to angels would come to his rescue in the hour of need." Craig, on the other hand, feels that "in the last seconds of his life Richard II strikes an honest blow in his own defense, and we somehow feel that our belief has been justified, that somewhere in this vain and ineffectual king there was hidden the soul of a man." Hunter calls his action "the flash

---

[41]Dean, p. 217; Ransome, p. 193; Goddard, p. 159; Craig, Interpretation, p. 134; Hunter, p. 32; Gervinus, pp. 292-293.

of manly vigor"; but, even so, "when all this is considered, there is still an unfavorable balance against him." Gervinus holds to a more middle ground; after having described Richard in prison as "ever employed in picturing his painful condition to himself . . . revelling, as it were, in his sorrow, and emptying the cup to the very dregs," he concludes: "It is wise of the poet that out of the different stories of Richard's death he chose that which exhibits him to us at the end in honourable strength, after having allowed us to perceive the attractive power of his amiability; it is therefore not without esteem that we take our leave of the commiserated man."

In V.vi Bolingbroke excoriates the deed of Richard's murder; his intentions and complicity in the assassination are still uncertain at the play's close. He summarily dismisses the murderer and puts on the appearance, at least, of grief and mourning.

Ransome summarizes the characteristics of the entire play by pointing out the balanced symmetry in the arrangement of characters and of plot-incidents. Richard and his followers have their almost diametrically opposite counterparts in Bolingbroke and his forces. Between the two groups stand York and Carlisle; the former is easy-going, loyal, "but with a loyalty which instinctively leads him to attach himself rather to the king <u>de facto</u> than to him who reigns <u>de jure</u>; while Carlisle, with a stronger hold on principle, is equally ready to denounce with firmness the

follies of a king, and to brave the wrath of a usurper."[42] The same balance is maintained in the plot. Richard is viewed in prosperity and in adversity, as is Bolingbroke--the one is under sentence of deposition, the other under sentence of banishment; one king is unable to command obedience even when it is demanded as a right, while the other even before his elevation to the throne can command an unquestioning submission; Richard cannot control his rightful kingdom and is weak as he violates justice (cf. most of the action throughout Act I), while Bolingbroke, even without any legality, shows practical ability to reform the weakened state and to mete out justice. On the external side of overt action, the play is a play of contrasts held in balance; the playwright achieves his purpose by concentrating on the character involved in this royal conflict revolving about the dethroning of a king. This serves as a foil for the "internal" drama which primarily involves Richard's twin character as unfit king, and lyric, tragic man.

This skeletal structure of the drama will be filled out by the subsequent study of the characters singly, of the theater and staging conventions, and of the poetry and imagery employed.

THE CHARACTERS IN RICHARD II

Travis Bogard points out that in discovering the "synthesizing core of character" providing the unity of the play, one must realize the complexity of this organizational core around which

---

[42] Ransome, pp. 195-196.

Shakespeare attempted to mould the king's appearances. For "Shakespeare is unquestionably concerned with Richard as both a public and a private figure" but he does not portray both aspects simultaneously. Richard first appears as God's delegate, the symbol of kingliness (and the actor must "labor diligently" to interpret his display of arbitrary and despotic force so as to create a portrait of frivolity consonant with the later manifestations of the king's character). Then Richard shows himself the petulant prince with the dying Gaunt. Midway through the play he claims the audience's sympathy for the first time when, upon his return from Ireland, he is shocked into the realization that his forces have abandoned him. Later he assumes the role of poseur on the battlements at Flint Castle--"to protect himself from the cold eyes of Bolingbroke, he must cling desperately to the mask of the ceremonial ruler; wavering and faint-hearted, he must force himself to maintain the dignity of a king; the effect is poignant, a moving, if somewhat artificial portrait which presents the idea of anointed majesty, but which at the same time suggests the presence of a suffering human being."[43] Finally, Richard appears as the man and philosopher in Pomfret prison.

The crucial act is the third, in which for the first time Richard's character "as king and mortal are brought into close

---

[43]Bogard, p. 204; cf. Craig, Introduction, p. 115: "It would make less difference to us, this posturing, if we did not feel that somewhere within this vain, shallow, and self-destructive king there was hidden the soul of a man."

conjunction" where "no presentation of externals [the formalities of ceremony alone, as in the earlier acts] will entirely suffice to do justice to the sympathetic Richard--to the suffering king entering the world of the dispossessed."[44] The character of weak king dominates the first part of the play, while the character of sensitive man comes more and more to the focal center of the action in the latter three acts. Act IV.1 highlights "the pathetic figure huddling in the robes of ceremony." In the earlier portion of the scene much of the protagonist's suffering is brought out, as before in the play, by Richard's own literal description of his sorrows. He does this by speeches "elaborating stage gesture, ritualistic in effect, but empty of personal emotion." The scene rises, however, at the mirror incident. And with the breaking of the mirror the playwright seems to depart from the outer man's "external manners and laments" as he perceives and re-creates the inner man. This he does in the only way of imaging true grief: in silence. A moment of climax is reached in lines 302-313, where Richard and Bolingbroke exchange brief words and Richard closes by crying "Then give me leave to go." "The tale of dispossession and its sequent national disturbance was originally the focal matter of the drama, but in Act IV, when Richard's character moves into a new, sharp perspective, tragedy, as it were, finally upstages history." This is Bogard's understanding of the play, and it corresponds on most points with the views of the critics and commentators

---

[44]This and following quotations from Bogard, pp. 204, 207-208.

previously cited. But Bogard's conclusion, that Shakespeare never fully succeeded in synthesizing the various dramatic manifestations of Richard's character, is placed in opposition to J. Dover Wilson's statement that "Shakespeare's genius succeeded in fusing these originally contradictory conceptions and in composing therefrom the figure of a king who seems to us one of the most living of his characters."[45]

Thus far the critics' general surveys of the play and its central emphasis of character. At this point the critics can furnish a brief summary of each of the play's characters, in order to analyze their respective types and their various functions in the dramatic structure. (These summaries will provide the recognized interpretations of the characters, against which the portrayals in the television adaptation can be compared for integrity and authenticity.)

Epithets paint in bold strokes the character of Richard. Ivor Brown looks upon the king as an example of "the contemplative, self-pitying failure type which was especially to fascinate Shakespeare and to evoke some of his greatest penetration of character and felicity of phrase in the presentment of an aching heart beneath a restless mind." Hunter speaks of Richard's displaying a "mingling of intellectuality, superstition, despondency, monarchical arrogance, and fondness for declamation." E. K. Chambers

---

[45] Ibid., p. 200, quoting J. Dover Wilson, ed., King Richard II (Cambridge, 1939), p. lix.

notes Richard's artistic temperament as contrasted to Bolingbroke's practical temperament: the king has a delicate imagination, he delights in music and pompous spectacle, he is an orator with a continuous flow of eloquence, he is a born actor who loves a dramatic effect. "Even in his downfall it gives him a thrill to take the stage in Westminster Hall and slowly to disembarrass himself of his crown with speeches of studied pathos." While having no real feelings for anyone but himself, Richard possesses a sensitivity of soul which wins the hearts of those with whom he is more intimate--the Queen, the young nobles who surround him, the groom who visits him in prison. He substitutes sentiment for action. And the shocks of misfortune stimulate him to exercise his imagination and elocution, as he dresses his griefs in illuminating phrases and exquisite images. Van Doren speaks of him as "a king accomplished in the rhetoric of his office . . .; his talk is big, his rhythms are tremendous"; in the third scene of Act II (ll.144-177), after a last pretense at a speech of strength, he swings to a new style "exquisite, high-pitched, limpid, lyrical, and boneless; its music listens to itself." C. E. Montague has agreed on the importance of "that half of the character which criticism seems almost always to have taken pains to obscure--the capable and faithful artist in the same skin as the incapable and unfaithful King." Montague denies the validity of Professor Dowden's criticism of Richard as "amateur in living, not an artist" and he is likewise opposed to Boas' description of Richard's "puerile" fancy (his

power of imagery) and its "pseudo-poetic" products. Montague concludes: "Still it is well to see what Shakespeare meant us to, and we wonder whether any one . . . can doubt that Shakespeare meant to draw in Richard not only a rake and muff on a throne and falling off it but, in the same person, an exquisite poet . . . with the quite distinct but not incompatible attributes of a typical, a consummate artist."[46] Richard's difficulty is precisely that he is "so fair a show" (III.iii.71) and nothing more; "to him that appearance is the reality, and tragedy is the inevitable result."[47] Richard's expression of his imaginative, poetic reaction to the conflict in which he is involved is necessary for the building up of the play; the poetic passages display character, and prepare the way for the failure and fall. In so far as such passages might be deleted from the play, by just so much would the motivation for the dramatic sequence of action be lost.

> As a character, Richard is weak, imprudent, and especially politically fainéant--so not much goodness is destroyed. As a tragic agent, he is almost not serious. But Shakespeare compensates for this by assigning to him extraordinary powers to react sentimentally to the complex events moved by others: great eloquence and a readiness to suffer and weep. . . . His fall is not so much fearful as his succeeding plight is pitiful; he becomes serious in adversity.
>
> After the complex plot, when Richard has become serious,

---

[46] Ivor Brown, Shakespeare (London, 1949), pp. 162-163; Hunter, p. 34; Chambers, Survey, p. 90; Van Doren, p. 90; C. E. Montague, "F. R. Benson's Richard II," Specimens of English Dramatic Criticism: XVII-XX Centuries, ed. A. C. Ward (Oxford, 1945), pp. 223-224.

[47] T. Spencer, "Dramatic Convention and Shakespeare's Early Use of It," Shakespeare and the Nature of Man, 2nd ed. (New York, 1949), p. 76.

> he understands himself as an historical figure: 'I wasted time, and now doth time waste me,' and he valorously resists the assassins. This makes very clear the double determination of the historical plot, for it means that as a man Richard is good but not as a king. Unfortunately the tragedy of Richard as a serious man does not have enough magnitude, and this after-thought scene is not powerful.[48]

Gervinus holds that the handsome, warm, affectionate Richard is easily provoked so that "in the moment of misfortune the defiance of an innate nobility is aroused in the midst of his sorrow, and in his death he appears as 'full of valour as of royal blood'." But he quickly adds that this nobility is obliterated by the reputation Richard has established in the early season of his life and reign (and so in the play)--a reputation for frivolity, for capricious and imperious tyranny, "incapable of hearing a word of blame and admonition even from the lips of his dying uncle." Craig sums up when he concludes: "Richard's troubles are inside himself; they are matters of character; and Shakespeare seems in this play to discover that character is destiny."[49]

Nevertheless, there still remains an antagonist in the play,

---

[48]Goodman, pp. 60-61.

[49]Gervinus, p. 282; Craig, Introduction, p. 116, and cf. pp. 113-114. See also: John W. Draper, "The Character of Richard II," Philological Quarterly, XXI (October 1942), 228-236. The author constructs a summary description of Richard's character from the king's own lines and from the references of others in the play. The resulting character sketch is pointed out as authentic, by being traced to the prevalent humour-psychology which described the mercurial disposition as good-natured, prodigal, ambitious, choleric, melancholy, sanguine, highly imaginative, unstable and vacillating; and many of these same characteristics were used by Holinshed in describing the historical Richard II of Bordeaux.

to help set off Richard's character. In balancing Richard against Bolingbroke, the playwright is but exhibiting in a concrete way the character of Richard as he is contrasted with the character of Richard as he should be. In Bolingbroke are the qualities of stability, of vigor, and of determined and purposeful action--all of which Richard sadly lacks.

But there is more to the contrasting characters than Tillyard's "contrast not only of two characters but of two ways of life,"[50] and more than Thaler's simple "persistently studied contrast . . . between fluent outspokenness and innate reticence . . . between the tragically fluent Richard II and the silently competent Bolingbroke." In fact Thaler himself suggests the depth of Bolingbroke's character when he asks: "How many critics have lavished praise upon the sentimental yet infinitely moving fluency of Richard II, and how few upon the masterly conciseness of Bolingbroke?" Craig feels that while the two men are obviously antagonistic forces embodied in opposite characters, still the stern, grasping, unsentimental Bolingbroke is not easy to understand in Richard II (he is rendered less puzzling when his character is developed in the Henry plays). In the present play "he speaks honestly and behaves well, and yet one feels that to have done what he did, Bolingbroke ought to have been presented as more crafty and more Machiavellian." Gervinus also questions

---

[50] E. M. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (New York, 1947), p. 258; and quoted by Dean, pp. 211-218.

Bolingbroke's actions and intent, for he did "hint at the murder of the king (though only remotely and indirectly to his subsequent sorrow and repentance)." Chambers is much stronger in his suspicions; to him Bolingbroke has no gifts or graces but the very pragmatic one of deliberate efficiency, a man "who knows how to bide his time, and moves irresistibly, with something of the terrible precision of a machine, towards his predetermined end. . . . His attitude towards the king during the early part of the play conceals a covert threat; at the end, though the less effective role is his, he keeps his temper, and treats the tirades of the victim, whose days he has already numbered, with a contemptuous and studied brevity."[51] Such brevity would be more than mere reticence. And such brevity causes him to remain somewhat of an enigma both to the rest of the dramatis personae and to the audience.[52] He seems to watch carefully, to move slowly and surely, appearing to be the mere servant of events when in reality he is perhaps their shaper. He knows the signs of the times--Richard's arbitrary tyrannizing, his impotence, the undercurrent of unrest among the nobles, the feeling throughout the realm. Things are hastening towards a crisis in the kingdom; Bolingbroke lets them follow a natural course, but stays close on hand to step in at the most opportune

---

[51]Alvin Thaler, Shakespeare's Silences (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), pp. 12, 23, 4; Craig, Introduction, p. 116; Gervinus, p. 295; Chambers, Survey, pp. 91-92.

[52]Cf. Edward Francis Mulhern, S.J., "The Hamartia of Richard II," Unpublished Master's Thesis (Loyola University, Chicago, 1956), pp. 69-71.

moment. "He is politically adept and decisive and seizes the occasion,"[53] "a man of policy adjusting his appearance to changing audiences."[54] Dean adds that in his own way Bolingbroke is histrionic; while Richard play-acts for the sake of his own feelings, Bolingbroke play-acts for the sake of carefully planned results. Play-acting or sincere, the usurper still moves forward according to his determined intent, and in this vigor of action--together with his being temperate, prudent, and sparing of words--he is strongly contrasted in the fourth and fifth acts with Richard's violent, shallow tyrannizing of the first and second acts. In fact, "the commencement scene, which essentially exhibits to us Richard's conduct as a sovereign, has its counterpart in the fourth act, where Shakespeare exemplifies Bolingbroke's dissimilar conduct in a similar position."[55]

On the other side, in favor of Bolingbroke's character, Van Doren describes his actions in the deposition scene (IV.i) as betokening a certain awkardness in dealing with the fanciful king and his poetry; at the moment of the breaking of the mirror, "the bewildered Bolingbroke, thus far reduced like everyone else to silence and embarrassed awe, makes the mistake of presenting Richard with a metaphor that he can go on with."[56] It is also true

---

[53]Goodman, p. 61.

[54]Dean, p. 215.

[55]Gervinus, p. 296; cf. Mulhern, p. 73.

[56]Van Doren, p. 92.

that in this same scene Bolingbroke quietly overrules the insolent Northumberland who is too importunately urging Richard. Bolingbroke is likewise rendered not unadmirable "by his magnanimity to the brave old Bishop of Carlisle, whose honest, outspoken, uncompromising loyalty to Richard draws from him [Bolingbroke] a reproof, but in language so restrained and temperate as to show that he honors the man much more than he resents the act."[57] Some of this same nobility of spirit, of "one born to rule," is manifested in IV.i in his dealings with Norfolk (reinstating him in his lands and honors) and, on the other hand, in his prompt imposition of sentence upon the "caterpillars" of the kingdom; also in V.iii with Aumerle and his parents (pardoning Aumerle's conspiracy against him). Bolingbroke thus appears to be humane and kind and patriotic--reflecting the patriotism of his father, John of Gaunt (perhaps a clue to Bolingbroke's righteous revolution against the prodigal "skipping king" who was wasting the land). "He does as that gardener would have had the lawful king do; with wise discretion he governs with mercy and justice, mildness and severity. And, at the same time, he behaves with that sure power and superiority which permits him to jest in this very scene."[58] Goddard treats this scene with Aumerle and the Yorks in a different way, however; he holds that the new king pardons Aumerle not out of mercy but as "an attempted purchase of indulgence in advance for

---

[57] Mulhern, p. 73.

[58] Gervinus, pp. 284, 296.

the murder of Richard, against whose life he is conspiring, precisely as his sparing of Carlisle's life is a begging of indulgence after that deed. These scenes are a series of unconscious confessions. . . . Shakespeare composes like a musician. There is more than meets the ear at first hearing. He is here exhibiting in action precisely those hidden impulses that modern psychology is now attempting to analyze and formulate."[59]

It is worth noting again that Bolingbroke's character is not fully resolved within the compass of this first of the cycle of Richard and Henry history plays. While Bolingbroke is an accomplished man of action, firm and intent in his silent way, Goddard seems correct in concluding that "he is not a figure of resolution and cannot satisfactorily occupy the stage and make an <u>end</u> when Richard is dead, for he does not counterbalance the pitiful virtues of Richard with commensurate virtues of his own. A kind of attempt is made to humanize him, in the clemency to Aumerle and the banishment of Exton; but these incidents again seem like after-thoughts and lack power. . . . It is better, I shall argue, to consider that the play does <u>not</u> end; it calls for an historical

---

[59]Goddard, pp. 157-158. This reference to "hidden impulses" and "unconscious confessions" would classify Goddard's comments as interpretation more subtle than would be evident in a production of the play; rather than "more than meets the ear at first hearing" this subtle aspect more properly would be "more than meets the mind and imagination at first (or even second) analytical reading." For this reason Goddard's comments on this scene are not subscribed to (in accordance with the criterion for acceptance established at the outset of this study).

sequel in which the memory of 'Richard, that sweet lovely rose' (I Henry IV, I.iii) will find a companion."[60]

To sum up: while perhaps not completely and clearly developed, the character of Bolingbroke is sufficiently delineated to provide in the concrete a foil to Richard's character of sham king. The struggle in the play, the tragedy, is brought about primarily by Richard's two-fold character as a king who fails and as a poetic man who grieves and only at the last moment begins to rise in his adverse fortune; secondarily, the tragedy is a conflict for the crown of England between one who has the right to rule but cannot, and another who was born to rule but has not the right.

Other characters in Richard II are much less outstanding, although they are important in moving the play forward by reflecting the characters of those about whom they speak and with whom they enter into action.

Old John Gaunt is important in the dramatic structure of the play. Besides his obvious formal role of traditional hero and patriot glorifying beloved England, he also--by his sorrow and concern for the welfare of his country (and also for his son and heir)--clarifies the issue of the drama "beyond mistaking, and, in flouting him, Richard scorns England itself."[61] The previous

---

[60] Ibid., p. 61.

[61] Webster, p. 171. See also Gervinus, p. 284; Craig, Introduction, p. 116. Gaunt's characteristics, including his strong family feeling and self-love, are mirrored in Bolingbroke who adds to these traits a shrewdness of purpose in his vigorous, silent

generation--chief among whom are Gaunt and York--frame the whole plot; "Gaunt's death is the immediate occasion for both Richard and Henry to err, Richard by usurping Henry's rights as heir, Henry by rebelling against the successive king. Gaunt, then, can be regarded as the thought of the resolution that prevents the complexity; and his death at once precipitates the complexity."[62]

On the other hand, there is the Duke of York whose character shows how the "previous generation" survives among men lost in the tragic error; "in pointing out the error, he is strong, but in action he is even comically weak."[63] He is a weak man who is thrust into the position of vice-regent and who subsequently compromises by remaining "neuter" when he is caught between sympathetic loyalty to the king-by-right (Richard) and prudent adherence to the "king-in-fact (Bolingbroke). His loyalties are mixed; his fidelity wavers under force of circumstances. He is incompetent, and wounded by the injuries done his family (in the banishment of Bolingbroke and in the confiscation of Gaunt's estates). Gervinus interprets his character rather more severely: while good-natured, York is proportionately indolent and rest-loving; but being at "an agitated age" he is kindled to irritation at the seizing of Gaunt's

---

actions. Bolingbroke stands in the reflected patriotism of his father, which casts some light of justification upon his return from exile and even upon his movements up to the throne itself.

[62]Goodman, p. 62.

[63]Ibid.

property. "He is the type of political faintheartedness and neutrality, at a time when partisanship is a duty, and of that cowardly loyalty which turns to the strong and powerful. . . . Helpless as to action, he loses his head in unutterable perplexity, but not his character. He resolves to remain neutral." He exhibits weakness which moves to unnatural obduracy in accusing his own son of high treason. "In this trait conscientiousness and fidelity are mingled indistinguishably with the fear of exposure and suspicion. Such is servile loyalty."[64] Van Doren takes a kindlier view of the Duke, who fussing like old Capulet over the grievous state of the realm:

> Come, sister,--cousin, I would say,--pray, pardon me
> . . . . . (II.ii.105)
> Tut, tut!
> Grace me no grace, nor uncle me no uncle, (II.iii.86-87)

is not so much a sorrower as a worrier; he is perhaps a parody, in the decrepit key, of Richard's full-noted grief. At any rate he is the one clearly comic personage in a play otherwise given over to tragic sentiment. . . . It [Richard II] sings in its own darkness, listening sweetly to itself."[65] York is the type of the "bewildered and loyal middle-class Englishman," the modest, conservative

---

[64]Gervinus, pp. 296-297; cf. Craig, Introduction, p. 116, and Interpretation, p. 130.

[65]Van Doren, p. 95. As to the absence of humor, Tillyard (pp. 260-261) points out what he considers a touch of it in I.iv where Aumerle describes to Richard his parting from Bolingbroke--the sarcasm or mockery in the lines about the only tears shed at the parting were those caused by the brisk northeast wind; Craig (Interpretation, p. 135) considers that "in Richard II there is only one rather amusing scene": V.iii (ll. 1-12), when Bolingbroke bitterly questions Percy and the other lords about his errant son, Hotspur.

country-gentleman figure; this impression of York "is almost comically concentrated in his insistence on his boots" (V.ii).[66]

Northumberland is crafty in serving as agent for Bolingbroke's approach to the throne. He is "well started on a selfish career"[67] which is to be further developed in the Henry plays. If he is the reflection of Bolingbroke's true ambitions, then the latter's character is clearly defined. But Northumberland appears more as the accomplished stage-manager or agent for Bolingbroke's actions on the path to the throne. He displays a certain arrogance in his manner; though smooth and flexible at times, he is often rough and unfeeling. It is noteworthy that he is the first to speak of Richard without including his title of king; he it is who states solemnly and forcibly Bolingbroke's oath that "his coming is but for his own"; in the scene of deposition he presses upon Richard with the list of accusations; and he it is who urges the arrest of Bishop Carlisle for the "treasonable" statements in his speech about righteousness and civic fidelity.[68]

The Queen serves to bring out the tender and affectionate qualities of King Richard. She is a pretty and pathetic figure in her misgivings and in her grief and longing for him when he is away or in danger. She appears a woman of character in the few minutes

---

[66]John Middleton Murry, Shakespeare (London, 1948), pp. 150-151.

[67]Craig, Introduction, p. 116.

[68]Cf. Gervinus, p. 294.

that she has something to say. But for the most part, she remains the conventionally mournful queen, "lightly done and with no important part in Richard II, but very sweet, womanly, and wise in her few speeches."[69]

The Bishop of Carlisle stands forth as the ideal churchman, devoted to principle, who warns and corrects the king for his wilful errors but who likewise remains staunchly loyal to him as the lawful ruler. The Bishop is honest, outspoken, and uncompromising; Bolingbroke's reaction to his strong outbreak in the deposition scene gives an indication of the esteem and veneration in which the Bishop was held by all.[70]

The other minor characters in the play are quite straightforwardly sketched; they speak and act consistently in the little parts they play. The gardener (III.iv), "impossibly sententious,"[71] supplies something of a clue to the political theme underlying the drama. The simple workers, poetic as are all the other characters peopling Richard II, use their lyric imagination to construct a political analogy drawn from their own horticultural experience. The homily "in the manner of the early plays . . . [is] elaborate, characteristically externalized."[72] Not unlike the porter in

---

[69]Craig, Introduction, pp. 18, 116; cf. Webster, p. 171, and Tillyard, p. 258.

[70]Gervinus, p. 288; Mulhern, p. 73.

[71]Tillyard, p. 258.

[72]Spencer, p. 132, n. 5; cf. Goddard, pp. 159-160.

Macbeth, the gardener here supplies something of an interlude; and yet this scene, too, directly advances or at least sustains the dramatic action of the entire play.

A final comment is in order concerning the silent actors--the lords, officers, gentlemen and servants, attendants, et al.--who say nothing but nevertheless are part of the play. Often enough a scene depends upon them to mirror the emotions and thought which the dramatist wishes to achieve in a given part of the play. "At the beginning of the plays, the lineless actors must often establish for us the atmosphere that surrounds our principals, the state of 'public opinion.' What elements in the community approved of Richard II, what sort of people disliked or mistrusted him, and why?"[73] This point emphasizes once again that the play is an integral production, depending upon the author's original conception, upon the interpretations and individual creative talent of the actors, of the directors and designers, of the theater technicians, and even of the musicians; they must all be fused harmoniously into an authentic production of the "two hours' traffic of our stage."

ELIZABETHAN THEATER AND STAGING

An important factor influencing the dramatic elements found in Richard II is the Elizabethan physical theater, and the manner of staging plays. As a practical dramatist, Shakespeare conceived

---

[73] Webster, p. 107; cf. also p. 30.

his plays with a definite purpose; they were to be played on the Elizabethan platform stage. The nature of these early theater facilities played a part in determining the playwright's conception of a dramatic work, and in establishing what the dramatist had in mind as to the proper execution of his work. A brief summary will point out these elements which have a significance relative to the play now under consideration.

The simplicity of the Elizabethan theater and stage underlay its assets of mobility and adaptability. It also accounted for the particular intimacy achieved between the actors and the audience who "seemed to some extent to be actual participants in the performance, as, for example, in soliloquies, where it is sometimes difficult to tell whether the actor is talking to himself or to the audience."[74] There was no curtain on the platform and so there was no sharp demarcation into acts and scenes; as a result, the dramas were played continuously from beginning to end (for the most part) and were accordingly much more rapid in action and in total time per performance than on today's modern stage with its proscenium arch and elaborate tableau-like effects. Being free of interruptions in the form of scene changes or act waits, the Elizabethan play possessed a "flowing, unchecked rhythm."[75] This absence of confining background sets, together with the conventions of the

---

[74]Craig, Introduction, p. 11.

[75]Webster, pp. 51-52, 68-69; cf. Craig, Introduction, pp. 10-11.

inner and outer balcony stage areas, permitted the playwright to obtain effects which today's theater aims at with its picture stage and act curtains; but the Elizabethan craft of physical production necessarily made use of methods different from today's.

Because of its qualities of continuity, rapidity, and intimacy--which qualities arose immediately out of the form of the theater and its stage--the Elizabethan drama enjoyed an unrestricted manipulation of the element of time, as well as a fluid spatial freedom. The unrestricting stage was highly adaptable to the flexibility demanded for conventions of place and time subtly and meticulously fitted to the author's dramatic purpose. The continuous flow of action, not jarred by act- or scene-waits, added to the dramatic pace of the production. (The flourishes of music called for were utilized to introduce new sets of characters as the scenes flowed on one into another.)

Shakespeare and his contemporaries achieved what Robert Speaight calls "the poetic realism which was the secret of the Elizabethan achievement." The playwright depended upon the power and beauty of the language to produce the dramatic imagery, action, atmosphere, and effect. Wood-and-canvas scenery often works a quite contrary effect; Lamb has pointed out that "the elaborate and anxious provision of scenery, which the luxury of the [present] age demands . . . works a quite contrary effect to what is intended. . . . In plays which appeal to the higher faculties it positively

destroys the illusion which it is introduced to aid."[76]

In whatever way the modern stage produces Shakespeare, the fundamental question and criterion for its validity and effectiveness remains the same; whether in America (with its late-1940's trend to economic, austere, stylized setting) or in England (with its continuing trend towards rich and complex stage décor), "in both cases the touchstone is the same: to what extent has the stage design served to interpret the play?" Excessive staging can distract from and, worse yet, can misemphasize and misinterpret the meaning and beauty of the poetry in the play. The modern producer must interpret Shakespeare as faithfully as possible; he must produce an integrated piece of theater, which projects the full intention of the author to hundreds of people simultaneously who are of a wide range of character and receptivity. The question is always: how can Shakespeare's authentic intention be preserved in modern terms? Shakespeare's own authentic meaning of his play--of his plot and characters and action--must be learned in part by determining the stage instruments and conventions which shaped his craftmanship.[77] The modern producer may then employ a legitimate amount of creative invention, "provided always that such invention is readily conceivable in terms of the lines themselves and true to

---

[76]Speaight, quoted by Webster, p. 75.

[77]Ibid., and pp. 28-29.

the spirit of the scene."[78]

The Elizabethan dramatic conventions of place and time dispensed with countless problems of accuracy and plausability on these twin points. Often in the play, indications are few or nonexistent as to the location of the scene or as to the interval of time elapsing between actions. Often enough a hint of the locality is found in the lines spoken; no more was needed for the Elizabethan audience, intent not on the stage devices but on the spoken word of the drama.

In Richard II the geographical scheme of the action, while not always explicit, is always quite clear. Shakespeare arranges the sequence of scenes (or "segments" of the whole play's action, if you will) in a way that allows for the proper progression of the actions; between the actions a great lapse of time may sometimes be presumed, but the sequence itself is always accurately ordered. At times, short scenes are inserted to allow for an interval demanded by the action necessarily implied between scenes. For example, in Bolingbroke's march through England (II.iii and III.i), Percy joins them in Gloucestershire (in II.iii) to tell Bolingbroke and Northumberland that Bristol lies ahead. Then the very short scene of II.iv is interposed, in which the Welsh soldiers speak briefly. After this Bolingbroke and his company re-enter "as at their camp at Bristol." Merely to have left the stage, then to return after

---

[78]Arthur Colby Sprague, Shakespeare and the Actors: the Stage Business in His Plays (1660-1905) (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), p. 175.

a moment's pause, would have been awkward. "Such a gap of emptiness--even so small a one--would check the flow of the story. It would involve explanations too; something would have to be done to give us the sense of shifted place and intervening time, which the intervening scene quite naturally, and, so to speak, tacitly gives. And this is put to further use; its twenty-four lines between Salisbury and a Welsh Captain tell us of Richard's fortunes. Again we are nowhere in particular; but the Captain's accent and Salisbury's ' . . . thou trusty Welshman' are informing enough."[79] By references in the speeches Shakespeare is very often able in this play to keep clear the journeyings of Richard (to Ireland, back at Wales, to Flint Castle, and then to Westminster Hall) and of Bolingbroke (Gloucestershire, Bristol, Flint Castle). "The key to this as to all Shakespeare's stagecraft is in the axiom that illusion lies in the characters and their action and nowhere else."[80] The point is that the whereabouts of the characters is often enough unimportant or at least of secondary concern; and the stage had no such "integrity of place as is conferred on ours by the illusion of a painted scene." The effects made possible by the fluidity of the Elizabethan stage belonged more particularly to swift and diversified action. "The Elizabethan stage likewise could be almost imperceptibly resolved from 'anywhere' to 'anywhere'; and it could be

---

[79]Granville-Barker, p. 59.

[80]Ibid., p. 60. Italics in the original.

dissolved into as near to 'nowhere' as made no difference."[81]

The convention of time is more than mere speed of sequence and incident. Besides mere continuity, time must have significance and dramatic value. And yet, on the flexible Elizabethan platform the playwright's freedom in time, as his freedom in use of space, is only limited by apparent likelihood and the illusion of the moment. The sense of actuality in time-sequence can be achieved fairly easily; but the important thing for the dramatist is to supply dramatic import to the sequence of incidents. When watching the action "the audience must be made as conscious of its purpose as will keep them expectant, must sometimes be led to the brink of foreknowledge--and then the action must go swiftly forward, leaving them the more interested to follow."[82]

In Richard II the time sequence unfolds rather consistently; but often enough the calendar or hour-glass is not strictly consulted since the dramatic effect is all that is really necessary for the playwright's purpose. The first two scenes for the most part sum up matter that has presumably gone before; only in the third scene does the action begin to move, and from then on it goes swiftly. The action is not uninterrupted, but it is in the manner of relays: when one scene comes to a close, the thread of the story

---

[81] Ibid., p. 63. The modern stage has lost much of this; the cinema and television have reclaimed these advantages not so much by simplicity of imagery as by fluidity of technique.

[82] Ibid., p. 64.

is picked up to be carried on in the next scene. The only concern of the dramatist is for the dramatic effect; that is what determines him. Once the play has begun its course of action, there is no need or desire to slow it down by adhering to the intervals of time necessary in reality for certain events to transpire. "And just as he has the play moving with the right impetus (it has taken long enough to get going) he certainly does not want to slow up, pad out the action with irrelevancies or cover the intervening events with a chorus, and then have to work up speed again. For Shakespeare time has its dramatic uses, but no rights of its own."[83]

To conclude this section on staging: the absence of distracting scenery and of long waits between acts would fix the audience's attention upon the actors and the progress of the action as manifested in their words. Hence the demand for powerful imagery and for the actors' "exuberance" in displaying emotion. And in the poorly lighted theater a reserved, conservative gesture or facial expression would easily be lost; projection of an actor's part demanded that it be played to the full. Because of the importance given to the spoken word, the plays "abound in verbal displays of all kinds, quibbles, puns, repartee, stichomythia, descriptions, soliloquies, orations. . . . An emotional crisis is elaborated not by business but by argument and rebuttal [even if it be only that

---

[83] Ibid., p. 66. For more details of the scholars' findings and conclusions relative to Elizabethan theater structure, appearance, and facilities, see below, Appendix I, p. 179.

of one person with himself]. . . . For the play was not intended to rely on our paraphernalia of scenery, lights, and decoration, but to force its entry into our imagination through the beauty of its spoken lines."[84] In so far as modern stage productions (in the legitimate theater or on television) employ elaborate staging, they run the risk of losing the precise source of Shakespeare's original power and beauty. Whether they succeed or fail must be determined by a study of each production singly. (The present study will concern itself solely with a specific presentation of Richard II on television.)

ELIZABETHAN POETRY AND IMAGERY

The consideration of the language used in Elizabethan drama is an important one for understanding any play of Shakespeare. In Richard II a large part is played by poetry and imagery in expression. For reasons already mentioned, the Elizabethan theater emphasized expression rather than gross action (by the latter is meant actors' movements and stage settings with changes of scenery). The power, beauty, and depth of the play was fused into the living language. This language was the vehicle of thought; moral, philosophical, political currents were developed within the framework and by means of the language. This language was likewise the vehicle for building and resolving the plot and for portraying the

---

[84] Ashley H. Thorndike, Shakespeare's Theatre (New York, 1925), pp. 400, 402.

characters. The soliloquy was important as a direct means of self-revelation; this stylistic convention could also be employed for telling the story itself (the character then became something not unlike a chorus). It is especially valuable in the plays involving more introspective characters.[85] The poetic language and the extended soliloquies which to today's ear might seem excessive and artfully "literary" have definite function in Elizabethan drama. Or better: the drama functions through the poetic language.

Works produced in the Elizabethan age evidence the influence of the then-current process of Latinization which reached its climax in the seventeenth century in Browne and Milton. The rhetoric resolved itself around two basic figures, balance (including antithesis) and repetition; and it naturally exerted a potent influence on the shape and design of English sentences. The part played by balance and repetition in Shakespeare's work is particularly evident in Richard II and King John; this earlier style of elaborate figures, of pedantic and ornate words, was replaced in the later plays by a more natural form of verse. Thus the state of the developing English language--not only its forms but its style as well--accounts for some of the more conspicuously ornate passages in the earlier plays.

More significant in determining the exuberance of language found in his earlier plays is the phase of dramatic experience and skill through which Shakespeare was passing at the time. He at

---

[85] Cf. Granville-Barker, pp.xxi-xxxii, 59-60, 126.

first wrote drama in this more "lyrical vein, with his singing robes on, with an abundance of passionate and highly coloured speech, and with the aid of rhyme and other devices of lyrical utterance."[86] But he gradually developed language and verse more varied and flexible and therefore more suitable for dramatic expression. Richard II reflects Shakespeare's earlier stages of development and his newly-found consciousness of his poetic powers; this growing ability and awareness of the music of the English language he demonstrated in the lavish speeches of Richard.[87]

And yet, most significant of all in Shakespeare's use of language--and most valid of the reasons for his lyric style in Richard II--is the fact that he was a poetic dramatist. He was concerned not so much with expression of his poetic powers as with accurate delineation of character through the dramatic medium of the spoken word coupled with appropriate actions. As Chambers was quoted at the outset of the present study: "To say that the play is lyric is

---

[86]Chambers, Survey, p. 88.

[87]Cf. Van Doren, p. 85; Craig, Introduction, p. 113, points out that: "It is known that in Shakespeare's early plays he uses more rhyme for serious dramatic discourse and less prose, has more end-stopped and fewer run-on lines, and fewer double or feminine endings, and that in the earlier plays he indulges freely in figurative language, conceits, and rhetorical figures. . . . There is no practical way of measuring figurative language, but it should be agreed that Richard II is very high in this particular evidence of Shakespeare's youthful exuberance." But cf. Goddard, p. 149: "All young men with a poetical gift pass into a stage when they are hypnotized by words. They have not yet grasped the relation between verbal symbols and life. . . . In a sense Shakespeare may be said to have faced this danger [of over-abundance and excess] in Richard II and subdued it." See below, p. 72 and n. 105.

by no means to say that it is not dramatic also. On the contrary, every element in it is carefully subordinated to the strictly dramatic end of throwing into powerful relief the strong contrast and conflict between the two principal characters, Richard and his cousin and supplanter, Henry of Bolingbroke."[88] The verse reveals in the most accurate and powerful way possible the thoughts and desires and fears of the characters. "Shakespeare's splendid poetry is there true to life in a more subtle way; he gives us the interpretation of [the characters'] thoughts."[89]

Shakespeare individualized the style of the speech used by his various characters in order to reflect the nature of their characters in their very speech.[90] Imagery thus has a definite and important dramatic function as a means of dramatically portraying a character through his own lines. Shakespeare has purposefully marked a few of his characters with prolixity; Richard and Polonius are outstanding in this respect--neither of them can be brief, but takes any occasion as a chance for a speech. What might be termed Shakespeare's excessive rhyme and florid style is really employed by him with conscious intent; here in Richard II, to portray sententiousness and sentiment he uses relatively extravagant rhetoric,

---

[88]Chambers, pp. 88-89.

[89]W. L. Phelps, "Shakespeare on the Modern Stage," Twentieth Century Theatre (..., [ca. 1918]), p. 103.

[90]Mikhail M. Morozov, "The Individualization of Shakespeare's Characters through Imagery," Shakespeare Survey: II, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge, 1949), p. 83.

especially for the three most loquacious characters--Richard, John of Gaunt, and York. The qualities of each of their characters are thus dramatized and given appropriate dramatic form by this greater use of rhyme and rhetoric.[91] Van Doren refers to Richard's ability to "wail in perfect glory" when he pours forth analogies in the deposition scene in such a way that "far from concealing his art, he calls attention to it with every gesture"; and after Bolingbroke prosaically protests to him ("I thought you had been willing to resign"), Richard "in his next long speech must pull out the stops of pity." But, as noted earlier, there is a dramatic purpose in all this: "he is happy with his sorrow, he is functioning through grief." Richard's self-love is manifested in this "infatuation with the art he so proudly and self-consciously practices. That is what 'Richard II' is about, and what even its plot expresses. Its unity therefore is distinctive and impressive."[92] Hence the importance of this sustained poetic prolixity; any modification of it will seriously affect the integrity of the play.

Ransome complains that in many of the Richard II scenes there is an excess of this prolixity and over-refinement of sentiment, especially in the deposition scene "where Richard, with exasperating verbosity, tells us little or nothing which adds to our knowledge of his character."[93] But, on the contrary, this is precisely the

---

[91]Craig, pp. 113-114; Hunter, pp. 269-270.

[92]Van Doren, pp. 92-93, 95, 89.

[93]Ransome, p. 194.

dramatic significance of Richard's continuous attitudinizing in delicate poetical form. In the very act of constructing lyrical similes one after another, he is showing in verbal action what he truly is. The audience can experience first-hand what would be far less effectively communicated by someone else's merely telling the audience about Richard's temperament. Therefore the scenes of this theatrical and over-rhetorical trait in Richard's speech and action are far more effective dramatically than they would be otherwise. The shallow, oscillating, highly-sensitive, impetuous, vain character of Richard displays itself directly in such scenes as I.iii (his arbitrary handling of the contest and sanctions of banishment), III.ii (his ecstatic poetizing on his return to English soil), IV.i (the elaborate figures concocted during the deposition scene), and V.v (Pomfret prison where he hammers out fanciful similes expressive of his grief and fallen state). As with the language, so with the concomitant actions, Richard's theatrical folly exhibits conceited and strained attention to the devices of rhetoric and gesture. "With all necessary allowances for the conceitfulness of the age and of Shakespeare's early manner, this is worse than the customary--worse with a badness which argues the author's intent to color the character of the speaker."[94] Hunter here refers to III.ii, where Richard salutes the royal earth of England with his hands (such a grotesque poetic conception that it is entirely in accord

---

[94]Hunter, p. 36; see also pp. 37-42, 46-47; and Van Doren, p. 90.

with Richard's proclivity to excessive poses and ornate, ineffective eloquence--labeled "rhetorical piety" by Dowden[95]). The remarks may equally apply to the other scenes mentioned above.

A final proof that Shakespeare consciously planned Richard's poetizing to extend as far as it does, is found in Richard's own words. After lengthy lyrical discourses on his woes, he more than once turns to those gathered around him and complains that they look on unsympathetically--that they dislike his attitudinizing and do not appreciate his expressions of grief. He knows that they are taking his behaviour poorly and even with disdain; he accuses them of mocking him: "Mock not my senseless conjuration, lords." (III.ii.23) And with Aumerle atop the battlements, after dwelling on the imaginary graves dug by their tears, he returns to a level of reality when he recognizes Aumerle's reaction to his elaborately-wrought poetry:

> . . . . . Well, well, I see
> I talk but idly, and you laugh at me. (III.iii.170-171)

And another character, Northumberland, corroborates this reaction of Aumerle, after the "Down, down I come" and "night owls shriek" speech:

> Boling. What says his Majesty?
> North. Sorrow and grief of heart
> Makes him speak fondly, like a frantic man.
> (III.iii.184-185)

Thus Shakespeare is quite aware of the poetry's excess; he even

---

[95]Hunter, pp. 34-35, quoting Edward Dowden, Shakespeare: His Mind and Art, 7th ed. (London, 1883), pp. 173-178.

takes pains to make clear to his audience that this excess is intended and has a dramatic purpose--to portray the sensitive, sentimental Richard. If this poetic excess be tempered in any production of the play, therefore, more than just the quantitative integrity suffers; the very heart of the play--Richard's character--is modified. If elaborate speeches be dropped while the more straightforward speeches remain, Richard's character is no longer what Shakespeare intended. The play is no longer Shakespeare's. Editors and adaptors must retain a proportionate representation of the rhetorical speeches of Richard, if they are to present the Richard II originally conceived by Shakespeare.

A further point must be made about the matter of the poetry. Metaphor and imagery are of course the very stuff of poetry; poetry is woven from them. But imagery takes on added significance, with a peculiarly dramatic function, when certain types of imagery predominate in the characters' speeches. A study of the imagery used by a character throughout a play will reveal in no small way the temperament and nature of the character using this imagery. While Shakespeare is a dramatic poet, the emphasis must not be placed on his power as a poet alone; he is likewise a dramatist (rather, the dramatist). Accordingly one can expect to find, and de facto one does find, a careful (though often subtle) realism in his characters; they possess specific psychological traits, and hence distinctive styles of speech. Morozov, in his analysis, finds "definite laws governing the imagery of individuals. . . . Shakespeare's

characters do not speak for the author but, so to say, 'for themselves,' i.e. are independent individuals (in other words we shall obtain new confirmation of Shakespeare's realism); secondly, we shall record one of the means by which Shakespeare (probably subconsciously) individualized the speech of his characters; and, finally, the particular figures of speech predominating in the role of any given character will provide us with a valuable key to that character's psychological make-up."[96]

Concomitant with this development of character protrayal, Shakespeare presents a line of thought by an independent development of the system of imagery. A particular image is sustained throughout the play, and is used by more than one or even by many characters.

> Put formally: when several characters independently and throughout the play employ the same system of images, the distinction becomes an independent part of the plot by implying a thought, action, etc., whatever is the principle of the system. For it is not in character for different characters to use the same images.
>
> The system of images in Richard II comprises: the sun, its darkening by clouds, day and night, thieves at night, storms on sea and land, land flourishing and land flooded, brine and balm, silver water, tears, steel swords and golden crowns as crops, gardens pruned and unpruned, nettles and serpents, meteors, sunset and Phaeton, graves and testaments, clocks and music.
>
> The principle of this system is obviously some such theory of due and undue succession as explained above: time, order, the right season, and their derangements.[97]

Of moment in this play, for instance, is Richard's continual

---

[96]Morozov, pp. 83-84.

[97]Goodman, pp. 64-65.

seeking for poetic expression of his woes; rather than take action against his own "sea of troubles" he elects to sit and ponder them. This pondering constitutes his own unreal world, wherein he can construct elaborate parallels to glorify his divine-right position and to canonize his royal "martyrdom" (precipitated by his own inaction). Richard pours forth elaborate exposition of the griefs fallen about his uncrowned head, by means of the familiar parallel between the cosmos and the state, between the sun and the king. The images which he uses "are those which sixteenth-century convention supplied: the parallel between the sun and kingship, the parallel between the rule of the king on earth and the rule of God in heaven. To the last he is an inveterate seeker of correspondences, and when he is alone in prison just before his death, he is still hunting for parallels, trying in vain to turn his prison into a macrocosm."[98] Other characters in the play speak of him in the same way, "as if to re-inforce his own view of himself" (cf., for example, the Bishop of Carlisle in IV.i.125; Percy in III.iii.62-68; and York, III.iii.69-72).

The importance of imagery is clear. To remove the poetic imagery from the play would be to modify or even destroy the character using it in his speeches; it would also wrench the symbolism which is closely interwoven into the plot. The highly poetic "sun-imagery is as much a part of Richard as his dream of divine

---

[98]Spencer, pp. 75-76.

kingship. Take away the symbolism and you no longer have the Richard II Shakespeare was trying to portray."[99] The basis for which Shakespeare used the sun-imagery in the play was Richard's predominant characteristic: his idealized dream of the divine kingship, which is the source of the whole tragedy of Richard II; it is the hamartia which sets the underlying theme of the play. This definite pattern of imagery is more than iterative; its purpose, every time it appears, is to expose the character of the king, and so to develop more clearly his hamartia; by this patterned imagery Shakespeare establishes the temperament and personality of the king. The sun-imagery is therefore not an excrescence (as Professor Caroline Spurgeon would have it) but an integral part of the dramatic work; to remove any of it would be to injure the integrity of the play in proportion to the amount and type of imagery deleted. The poetic imagery is "representative of the unity of which it is itself a constitutive part."[100] In dramatic tragedy the real

---

[99]Mulhern, p. 49; and cf. pp. 35-38: "Richard is a person blinded by the dream of divine kingship and living in a world of illusion. Shakespeare has used the symbolism of the sun-imagery because, more than any other artistic device, it brings forth these characteristics of King Richard's personality" (p. 36). And "by using the sun's effects, Shakespeare foretells the tragedy which is to take place" (p. 38). The sun-imagery--at least implied throughout the play where not explicit--provides a thread of unity; it fore-echoes the development of the play's plot and of the characters of Richard and Bolingbroke: the tragedy of "the sun king."

[100]Ibid., p. 35; cf. also pp. 32, 36, 47; see Samuel Kliger, "The Sun Imagery in Richard II," SP, XLV (April 1948), 196-202, for an analysis of the sun-imagery throughout the entire play; cf. Caroline F. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (Cambridge, 1937), pp. 233-235.

significance of imagery lies in the part it plays in the organic system of relationships inhering in the tragic form; the pattern of imagery in tragedy is a changing one, to correspond to--and even to advance--the plot and character development. This is true of the sun-imagery here; those images applied to King Richard in the rising action are suggestive of his prosperity and power; then, at the falling action--the reversal of his fortune--comes the correlative expression in other imagery, suggesting (1) an eclipse, (2) the oncoming of night, and (3) cold, sunless climate. "The imagery contributes to the tragic form of the play and aids in completing the tragic form by arousing no less than the plot, pity and terror."[101] Therefore, in so far as the imagery is deleted from a production of the play, by just so much does the edited version lose its thread of unity and continuity, its fullness of character development, its totality and integrity of meaning and of beauty.

It would be good, at this point, to sketch briefly this carefully wrought imagery of the sun and of its contraries of darkness and cold, since they provide no small part of the unity in Richard II.

At the play's opening Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray of treason and he uses the imagery preparing the way for the sun-imagery:

> Thou art a traitor and a miscreant,
> Too good to be so, and too bad to live,
> Since the more fair and crystal is the sky,
> The uglier seem the clouds that in it fly. (I.1.39-42)

---

[101]Kliger, p. 197. Subsequent quotations on the following pages will be from Kliger, pp. 198, 200-202. Cf. Mulhern, p. 36.

The sun-imagery is made explicit in the later scene, where the action is just beginning to advance the play's tempo:

> Mowbray. Then thus I turn me from my country's light
> To dwell in solemn shades of endless night. (I.iii.176-177)

These juxtaposed images of light and dark already prefigure Richard's impending tragedy; England is sun-lit, banishment is covered with shadow--for by the sun is meant, of course, the "sun-king" Richard II. To Bolingbroke, Richard says, as he cuts off part of the term of banishment:

> . . . . . Six frozen winters spent,
> Return with welcome home from banishment. (I.iii.211-212)

From the dark and cold of banishment, Bolingbroke is invited by Richard to return home "to the warmth of the sun" (which is Richard himself). The warmth-cold associations are closely woven into the texture of the tragic form.

> As a matter of fact, the basic theme of the play . . . apart from its tragic outcome, impinges on the warmth-cold juxtaposition. Richard's aestheticism is fundamentally out of touch with the stern realities of managing a kingdom. Richard strikes poses, abandons himself to his plight and even appears to enjoy it as his fertile imagination creates for himself a fantasy, all for the purpose of avoiding reality. The whole conflict between aestheticism and didacticism, imagination and reason . . . , the difference between things as they seem to be and things as they actually are, is stated clearly first in the play in a speech between Gaunt and Bolingbroke which significantly invokes the warmth-cold antithesis. Gaunt counsels that Bolingbroke's burden of exile will be lightened if he will endeavor to imagine that he has not been banished at all. Bolingbroke knows the emptiness of such advice and replies:
>
> Bol. O, who can hold a fire in his hand
> By thinking on the frosty Caucasus?
> . . . . . .
> Or wallow naked in December snow
> By thinking on fantastic summer's heat?
> (I.iii.294-295, 298-299)

Bolingbroke's return from exile marks the beginning of Richard's tragic end, and the images of darkness and cold create the strong sense of doom. Salisbury predicts sorrowfully Richard's doom in an image of the setting sun, which is significant at this turning-point of the play's action:

> Ah, Richard! with the eyes of heavy mind,
> I see thy glory, like a shooting star,
> Fall to the base earth from the firmament.
> Thy sun sets weeping in the lowly West,
> Witnessing storms to come, woe, and unrest:
> Thy friends are fled to wait upon thy foes,
> And crossly to thy good all fortune goes. (II.iv.18-24)

Richard himself exhibits his fatal tendency towards self-dramatization as he descants on the sun-image in III.ii.36-53: Richard's sun rising in the east (according to him) will spy out Bolingbroke who is lurking in the darkness of evil actions. But in another part of his speeches in this important scene, Richard "accepts defeat for himself and capitulates to Bolingbroke in terms of the appropriate day and night contrast":

> Rich. Discharge my followers, let them hence away
> From Richard's night to Bolingbroke's fair day.
> (III.ii.218-219)

Later, in the next scene, Bolingbroke speaks of Richard as he comes out upon the Flint Castle battlements:

> See, see, King Richard doth himself appear
> As doth the blushing discontented sun
> From out the fiery portal of the east. (III.iii.62-64)

But Richard weakly un-kings himself and, at least in words, steps from his brilliant throne:

> Down, down I come; like glistering Phaeton
> . . . . . .

> . . . Come down? Down, court! down, King!
> For night-owls shriek where mounting larks should sing.
> (III.iii.178, 182-183)

"Thus level upon level of the play's complex of meanings--the tragic theme, the errant imagination retreating from reality, the dualism between duty and caprice . . . --are assimilated to the sun-images, functioning as a legitimate dramatic means towards clarifying what would otherwise be made obvious by the plot itself." The continued manifestation of this is apparent throughout the play. In the fourth act, Richard significantly transfers the image to Bolingbroke:

> Oh that I were a mockery king of snow
> Standing before the sun of Bolingbroke. (IV.i.260-261)

The deposition scene brings this our in the mirror action, as Richard carries on in his mood of self-pity:

> . . . Was this the face
> That, like the sun, did make beholders wink? (IV.i.283-284)

With the Queen he uses the antithetical correlative to the sun-image when he speaks of banishment to the cold north:

> Part us, Northumberland--I towards the North,
> Where shivering cold and sickness pines the clime. (V.i.76-77)

The "sun king" has burned out. His sacred character derived from the divine right of kingship has been clouded and extinguished. Shakespeare has skillfully shifted the original, vivid, colorful images so appropriate to that theme. The blinding brilliance of Richard's royal position has been cloaked, so that now only his effeminate, dull, wavering glimmer of character as a man is allowed to glow forth. At the play's end a momentary flash emanates from

this human character before it, too, is extinguished by Exton's dagger. "This survey of the sun-imagery [accounts] for an integral work of art. . . . The survey of the sun-imagery reveals a prescient instinct of the end governing the work of art from the beginning. . . . Only the tragic form determines the collocation of sun-images in the play." Thus, modification or deletion of the passages embodying these important images positively harms Shakespeare's meaning and expression in the play. The depth and fullness of his plot and characters suffer in proportion to the imagery edited from any production script of Richard II.

Other images are not so essential to the play's meaning or movement; but they, too, have their part to play in the beauty and power of the total drama. G. Wilson Knight points out specific images of the sea and storms, which imagery is sustained through the play. Van Doren cites the repetition of the images of the dance, of the stage (of life), and especially of the tongue. The imagery used by many of the characters in the play is built on the "tongue" motif; Van Doren (and he is not alone in this) points out that this is most appropriate to a play which is for the most part a play of speech--of lyric wording; the images involving the tongue are thus expressive of the play's form. The words and images used in the play give it its peculiar unity of tone distinguishing it from most of Shakespeare's other plays.[102]

---

[102]Cf. Van Doren, pp. 85-87, and Richard D. Altick, "Symphonic Imagery in Richard II," PMLA, LXII (June 1947), 339. J. Dover Wilson is of the same opinion.

The poet's associational sensitivity employs certain words as thematic by bringing them into the speeches throughout the five acts. Earth, land, and ground are related words which occur no fewer than seventy-one times in Richard II; these symbolize Gaunt's blessed plot, this earth, "this earth of majesty" which is England; they are used by Richard as he speaks pridefully of "my earth"; a symbol of the vanity of human life appears in Salisbury's "I see thy glory like a shooting star / Fall to the base earth from the firmament." Blood figures strongly as part of the symphony of images blending the play into a harmonious whole. Unlike its thematic use in Macbeth, blood "in the history plays also stands figuratively for inheritance, descent, familial pride; and this is the chief motivating theme of the play--the right of a monarch of unquestionably legitimate blood to his throne."[103] The word is further involved in the significant blanch and blush, the paleness of complexion and even of pallor, which occur in the play many times. Tears and weeping play another part in the imagery; they are even conjoined with "rainy (eyes)" and "foul weather (with despised tears)." Plague, pestilence, and infection form another iterative pattern of imagery; the sweet-sour contrasts are repeated throughout the play; storms and tempests, the sea and water, play their role in the imagery.[104] The crown motif is an obviously

---

[103]Altick, pp. 345-346.

[104]Cf. G. Wilson Knight, The Shakespearean Tempest, 3rd ed. (London, 1953), pp. 32-69.

important piece of imagery about which to weave the play's development. This last image gives an impressive example of the part that imagery plays in the drama's progress:

> A thousand flatterers sit within thy crown,
> Whose compass is no bigger than thy head; (II.ii.100-101)
>
> . . . For within the hollow crown
> That rounds the mortal temples of a king
> Keeps Death his court, (III.ii.160-162)
>
> But ere the crown he looks for live in peace,
> Ten thousand bloody crowns of mothers' sons
> Shall ill become the flower of England's face, (III.iii.95-97)
>
> Now is this golden crown like a deep well
> That owes two buckets, filling one another,
> The emptier ever dancing in the air,
> The other down, unseen, and full of water. (IV.1.184-187)

To sum up: Imagery plays a particularly important part in Richard II, for it is a drama much devoted to poetry and to verbal play. The poetic unity of the drama is achieved by the harmonious arrangement and interplay of these many images. The most significant images as far as production of the play is concerned, are those of the sun (and darkness) and of the crown; in these the major themes of imagery would be immediately apparent and thus significant for the playgoer's understanding of the play's meaning and development. The other images would be less obvious and hence significant more in reading and studying the play than in watching a production of it on the stage.[105]

---

[105]It may be noted that in his use of imagery, Shakespeare in his earlier plays had not achieved the perfection of compressed, poignant suggestive metaphor which he displays in his later plays. His earlier imagery tends to be more explicit, complete, and drawn

Even in the more ornate passages with their florid language, the rhetoric is an organic part of the drama. "In the case of Richard II, these characteristics of the imagery are especially striking because they are so beautifully adapted to exhibit the central character. The perfection of the play, within its limits, is the perfection of union between character and a style that Shakespeare had mastered at that stage of his career. He had it at his fingers' ends and he found a character for whom it was dramatically right."[106] Therefore, the removal of any of this imagery from a production of Richard II would result in a less convincing character-portrayal and a less effective plot.

How television handled this delicate but important matter of imagery shall be treated in Chapter Four.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ORIGINAL MSS TEXTS

Since the analysis of television's fidelity to Shakespeare's original play depends heavily upon a comparison of the production script with the original MSS, the present chapter will conclude with a final note on the MSS texts and their significance in determining Shakespeare's intent in the drama.

Richard II was first produced by 1595 (there is a reference to

---

out; his similes are elaborate and diffuse, often extended by enumerations. Cf. Altick, pp. 364-365, and Madeleine Doran, "Imagery in 'Richard II' and in 'Henry IV'," MLR, XXXVII (April 1942), 113-122. See above, p. 57 and n. 87.

[106]Doran, p. 121.

such a performance given in December of that year[107]) and was considered as "out of date" by 1601. There is an original text probably printed from Shakespeare's original manuscript; this is the 1597 First Quarto (Q_1);[108] it is complete except for the famous deposition scene (IV.i), politically unacceptable at that time. "The quartos are not divided into acts and scenes, but the folio [F_1 of 1623] is, a circumstance that may indicate that there was a playhouse prompt copy available; this would account for the fact that the stage directions in F_1 are somewhat fuller and more careful than those in the quartos. Textual divergences are, however, not serious."[109] These two points, of act-scene division and of stage directions, are significant.

The plays in the Folio (F_1) are submitted to the formal five-act division, "which, lacking more than once any dramatic warrant,

---

[107]Cf. Letter of Sir Edward Hoby (of Westminster) to Sir Robert Cecil, 7 December, 1595, quoted in Edmund K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, a Study of Facts and Problems (Oxford, 1930), I, 351; II, 321. Cf. Craig, Introduction, p. 112, and Shakespeare: A Historical and Critical Study with Annotated Texts of Twenty-One Plays (Chicago, 1931), p. 75; Ivor Brown, p. 262; A. W. Pollard, "Shakespeare's Text," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, ed. Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 276-277; Peter Ure, ed., King Richard II, Arden ed., pp. xiii, xv ("Q_1 is likely to be fairly close to Shakespeare's autograph"), xx-xxi, xxvii (Q_1 is the best for all but the deposition scene, for which F_1 is most authorative).

[108]For the authentic MS date, cf. R. W. Babcock, "A Preliminary Bibliography of Eighteenth Century Criticism of Shakespeare," SP, XXVI N.S. (1929), 58-76; "A Second Bibliography...," ibid., 77-87; A. C. Partridge, "Shakespeare's Orthography in Venus and Adonis and Some Early Quartos," Shakespeare Survey: VII, pp. 35-47.

[109]Craig, Introduction, pp. 111-112.

one doubts to be Shakespeare's."[110] The criterion for the authenticity of such division must ultimately rest in the dramatic value of the time interval. In more than one play (as here, and in Coriolanus) the act divisions are marked at quite inappropriate points of the drama's movement. The drama's continuity must not be so severed; there must be a rise to a natural break, and then a resuming of the action after such an act or scene division. At other points during the play a pause in the action might be very valuable for emphasis and valid suspense. Historically, during the major part of Shakespeare's career there were no act-waits; it was only after the indoor playhouses came into vogue that there gradually arose the practice of having brief pauses filled with music. The five-act division is marked by the Folio for some, not all, of the plays; it does not represent Shakespeare's common practice but rather the classical scheme of play division which Ben Jonson had brought into fashion. Nicholas Rowe, in his edition of the plays, created the quite gratuitous scene divisions which now appear in all modern editions.

> It is important that we should clear our minds of anything which obstructs the unbroken flow of Shakespeare's writing and that in staging we should eliminate as far as humanly possible the breaks and checks which scene changes impose on it.
>
> We are not likely to be seduced into four act-intermissions, though we are forced to allow our audience at least one. . . . Richard II . . . seems to me to invite two entirely legitimate act pauses: one after the scene of Gaunt's death and another after Richard is taken to Flint Castle. In the

---

[110] Harley Granville-Barker, Prefaces to Shakespeare, Fifth Series: Coriolanus (London, 1948), p. 189.

first instance, Shakespeare's time emphasis, which is always a matter of the most delicate dramatic suggestion, is actually helped by the break in playing; and there are many similar cases where we gain rather than lose by an act pause.[111]

One final word on stage directions in the original text. The directions printed in even the earliest texts--quartos and folios--are not necessarily helpful in ascertaining the author's concept of how certain parts of the production should be staged. The reason is two-fold. First, we cannot determine precisely what the author placed there originally as distinguished from what was added during the early years of staging of the production. "We have no knowledge of what Shakespeare's fellows did to his scripts. No doubt they saw what went over well and what did not and operated accordingly. But at least he was there till 1616 to put up the age-long playhouse fight of the author against the actor who thinks he knows better."[112] Secondly, even the author's authentic directions consist in but brief indications of the action or business; "Alarums and Excursions" may serve for an entire sequence of marching, countermarchings, trumpets and drums, victories and defeats. "'Alarums and Excursions,' says Shakespeare, and we are left with our imaginations and a rather frightening margin for opportunity or error."[113] Still, there are certain clear-cut directions or

---

[111]Webster, p. 69; cf. Edmund K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage (Oxford, 1923), II, 541-542, 557.

[112]Brown, p. 265.

[113]Webster, p. 53.

suggestions in the speeches themselves, as in the deposition scene: "Here, cousin, seize the crown" . . . "Read o'er this paper" . . . "Urge it no more" . . . "Mark, silent king" . . . "Say that again."

It is the producer's responsibility, therefore, to preserve the play's integrity by discovering as accurately as possible what was Shakespeare's intention and meaning in the action of the play. By an honest, scientific, and at the same time sensitive and artistic approach to producing Shakespearean drama, one can strive to re-create the story and the characters as nearly as possible to the way in which the Master Dramatist conceived them. The producer and director must understand the original play, and they must appreciate the means which the Elizabethan playwright had at his disposal for staging the play--for these means helped guide his creative art. The modern producer must then work with the means currently at his disposal in the theater or on television, in an attempt to achieve the same dramatic effect that was originally achieved in the play.

Miss Webster summarizes this point:

> The modern producer has to be, in some sort, a translator; and he may not translate, as Shakespearean commentators do, for individual readers, one by one. . . . He has to produce an integrated piece of theater, carrying as nearly as possible the full intention of the author and projecting it simultaneously to several hundred people of the most variously assorted character and receptivity.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The whole convention of our theater has changed. The tacit covenant between actor, author, and audience is on a wholly different basis. How can we preserve Shakespeare's intention in our modern terms? We may, we must, try honestly and devotedly to divine his meaning. We must know, for that purpose,

> the instruments of staging that he used, for they shaped his craftmanship; and without a knowledge of them we shall often divine his intention wrongly.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> We must know our author and our audience and see to it that the actors interpret justly between them. The resources of the library, the skill of the theater technicians, the influence of individual creative talent among actors and directors, designers and musicians--all these must be fused into the 'two hours' traffic of our stage.'[114]

This is the responsibility that falls upon the shoulders of those involved in production of Shakespeare. The responsibility remains the same for the producer in the newer medium of television as well as for the producer for the legitimate theater. The following chapter will analyze the potential of the electronic medium--its assets and limitations for dramatic production. This summary study of the television medium itself will afford the background necessary for the subsequent chapter's evaluation of the effectiveness of this medium in the television production of King Richard II.

---

[114] Ibid., 28-30.

CHAPTER III

"LIVE" TELEVISION AS A MEDIUM FOR DRAMA

The modern electronic theater of television employs conventions proper to the size and nature of its screen-stage.[1] The nature of the medium involves technical elements which in turn influence artistic elements of the production. These technical and artistic instruments of staging are sometimes different from those of the legitimate theater. The restrictions as well as the assets of television facilities make it a unique medium for Shakespeare's dramas, originally created for the Elizabethan platform stage. The present study will now consider some of the important details of the television medium, in so far as they are significant in the production of dramatic material. This will involve a brief consideration of some of the fundamental technical points of telecasting: the camera use, staging limitations, microphone restrictions, over-all dimension specifications (to accommodate the average twenty-one-inch screen for viewing). Only the significant elements affecting drama production will be here considered. The

---

[1]See above, pp. 87-88. For a glossary of television terms used in this thesis, see below, Appendix II, p. 184.

chapter is not meant to be an exhaustive study of all the elaborate technicalities of television broadcasting, but rather a survey calculated to provide that understanding of the medium necessary for a study of the telecast of Shakespeare's Richard II. The matter of the present chapter will then be incorporated into the following chapter, which offers a comparative analysis of Shakespeare's original Richard II with the Hallmark Hall of Fame television production of the play.

Television is basically a photographic art form. Its power of communication, its portrayal of the beautiful, is highly dependent upon the sequence of photographic material--i.e., of pictures--of which it is composed. In contrast to the legitimate theater stage, the photography medium of television is similar to the cinema in its parallel advantages and handicaps.

Films and television have the advantage of a depth and expansiveness which the three-walled stage cannot know. The photographic media capitalize on mobility, flexibility, and speed because of multiple camera positions. These media also employ many different stage settings which, in the final artistic product, occur in rapid sequence. The media likewise exploit greater realism since they can not only accurately re-create settings (as can the stage in but a limited way), but they can originate the production from an actual site--be it highway, hotel, or mountain. Further, these media have at their disposal multiple special effects, electronic and optical. Of course, television and cinema can vitiate these

same potentials by going to excess or simply by misuse.

But the general overall advantage enjoyed by television as well as by cinematic production includes the asset of unconfined action, assisted by "the necessary flow of picturized movement," which exploits the "mobility of the camera and of its unique power to pick out significant details overlooked by the cursory eye." Further, "in spite of good dialogue, in which respect it most resembles a good stage play, the scenario provides that 'succession of everchanging dramatic imagery' that Mamoulian has called 'the very essence of film art.'"[2] Mobility is also effected between individual scenes by the fading in or out of a scene, or by superimposing the opening of a succeeding scene by way of a "lap dissolve"; all of this helps achieve the freedom of time and space so effective for vigorous forward movement of dramatic action.

Similar to narrative and descriptive technique of literary works, the photographic media can assume subjective "points of view" by use of camera position and angle, and by employing special camera effects (e.g., the much-used defocus, to represent a scene as viewed by a drowsy, doped, or drunken man). The camera may emphasize persons or objects by moving in to a close-up "shot" of that person or object; the attention of the audience is necessarily

---

[2]These and the following comments are from John Gassner, The Theatre in Our Times: A Survey of the Men, Materials and Movements in the Modern Theatre (New York, 1954), pp. 576-577, 577 (quoting Dore Schary, Case History of a Movie--a comprehensive explanation of cinematic work), 580; see also p. 582.

fastened on the large, clearly-pictured subject. Greater depth, power, and delicacy can be achieved by proper use of camera positions and shots; "especially useful is the reminder: ' . . . as soon as a given speech has gone far enough so that the audience can guess the rest of it, the picture cuts off from the speaker to the hearer as the speech continues off-scene.' Reason: to catch the reaction, to see what 'emotional effect that speech is going to have on the character to whom it's addressed.'" The use of camera thus has an editorial effect; the director can emphasize and even isolate certain elements of the production.

This emphasis and isolation can be employed with deeper significance, so that symbolism plays an important part in camera usage. Even inanimate objects can be singled out and so placed in juxtaposition with other shot sequences that a concrete symbol is thereby formed.

> [T]he screenplay holds interest as an example of the adaptation of dramatic form to modern times and to a mechanical medium, and as a new form of literature that has gradually developed a special structure. . . . We have in screen-drama a new dramatic structure, multi-scened, remarkably fluid, and free to employ a large degree of visual symbolism without losing concrete reality for even the least sophisticated spectator, since a picture is a picture. . . . Above all, the screen-play is playwriting possessing the mobility of the camera eye rather than playwriting limited to the comparatively static stage picture.

Dudley Nichols and John Gassner describe the potential of the medium of films (and, by legitimate extension, of television):

> Objects extrapolated from their surroundings can be used with tremendous effect, and a part can speak eloquently for the whole, while routine exposition can be reduced to a flash. . . . Seemingly unrelated 'shots' of objects in quick succession,

> superimposed on each other or dissolving into each other, may establish a situation, enforce a comment, or convey the essence of an emotion in fresh and startling ways. A poetry of sensations or relations is often achieved by this kind of composition, for which the technical word is 'montage.' . . . [F]ilms habituate us to freedom of movement in time and space. The viewpoint can also be tellingly differentiated for emphasis. The view can be expressively panoramic, distant and fully inclusive ('full shot'), fairly close and partially revealing ('medium shot'), or close and right on top of us (in a 'close up'). The view can also move to and fro, and up and down; it can expand or contract for revelation or emphasis; it can move with a character . . . or precede him. The scene can 'fade in' . . . by the gradual materialization of a scene. It can 'fade out,' the gradual disappearance of the scene creating a sense of pause or of finality, generally suggesting the end of a sequence. It can dissolve quickly or lingeringly into another image, suggesting not merely a lapse of time but a special relationship with the image that follows. . . . The scene can be 'cut'--that is, concluded abruptly, changed before its logical termination to achieve some staccato effect. Scenes, moreover, can be presented from the viewpoint of different characters, enabling us to see an object or some transpiring action as some character--personally involved or affected--views it, objectively or subjectively.
>
> The viewpoint of the camera excels that of the static spectator or reader, for it is all-seeing and omniscient. The composition of a screenplay is predicated on the fact that the camera can be moved in all directions and that the view on the screen is in continuous movement. The screenplay, too, is movement, of varying speed and duration. The actors are moving, the background is moving, objects are moving, symbols are moving, the angles of vision are moving.[3]

Hence, a play that involves a considerable number of speeches with little accompanying action can gain a good bit of animation and movement--provided always that this movement is moulded to the spoken lines with a scrupulous delicacy. The movement must emphasize, clarify, or otherwise enhance the spoken words; the mobility fused

---

[3]Ibid., 583-585, quoting from Twenty-five Best Plays of the Modern American Theatre, 1916-1929, ed. John Gassner and Dudley Nichols (New York, 1949).

into the stageplay by use of cameras must never distract from the spoken words, much less distort the meaning of those words.

The Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer movie presentation of Julius Caesar elicited the following comments exemplifying the assets and liabilities of the photographic media: "Director Mankiewicz has used the camera to provide an underlying rhythm which gives a good continuity from scene to scene. . . . The opening scenes exemplify this fluidity and rhythm, with the camera focusing upon certain key objects, like the bust of Caesar in the opening frame." But "the only difficulty with this techinque is that the camera may become restless, as is true in Brutus' soliloquy in his orchard (II.i). There is so much movement in this scene (a general fault of Olivier's Hamlet), that the audience may be distracted from the sense of the speech." Likewise are there pros and cons of technique in television, as in the National Broadcasting Company's Hamlet with Maurice Evans. Favorable comment noted that "the direction . . . revealed a number of imaginative touches designed to lend fluidity to the action and to point up relationships between the characters"; critical comment included a complaint that "the 'To be or not to be' soliloquy was staged with Hamlet looking at his reflection in a pool, a touch that seemed forced and 'arty."[4]

---

[4]Alice V. Griffin, "Shakespeare Through the Camera's Eye," SQ, IV (1953), 331-336. Laurence Olivier has noted that "Filming Shakespeare . . . you don't need tricky shots. You don't have to shoot up a man's trouser leg or photograph through keyholes. . . . Hollywood developed those techniques to make up for bad acting and weak scripts." Quoted in Newsweek, (March 19, 1956), p. 106.

The Columbia Broadcasting System's Othello received similar comment from the same critic: "As was true of the above-discussed productions, here again the camera was used to good advantage to establish relationships, to reveal subtle reactions through close-up, and to focus on the significant detail in a key scene."

Among the disadvantages of the photographic media, contrasted with the legitimate stage, is the absence of an audience. The presence of an audience creates a rapport between the actors and the spectators so that the latter become participators to the extent that they really influence the actors' presentations of the parts played. A "live" audience stimulates the actors and builds an atmosphere of dynamic involvement on the part of those on either side of the footlights. Films and television, on the other hand, lack this asset.[5]

A second problem avoided for the most part by the stage is that of distraction of the players due to technical machinery and

---

[5]Cf. Webster, pp. 301-302: "This is the glory of the living theater, and of the living theater alone; it is also the essence of Shakespeare's magic, that the spectators should themselves take part in the process of creation. . . . [T]he audience participates in [the actor's performance]; it is they who either give him wings or tie leaden weights to his feet. There is, in the theater, a personal magic; it can open our hearts, dazzle our eyes, lift us into a shared experience beyond ourselves. This is Shakespeare's magic; to it his genius was dedicated. You cannot print it in a book or confide it to a microphone. You cannot photograph it at all." Cf. also Leon Howard, "Shakespeare for the Family," Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, VIII (Summer 1954), 357: Playgoers "in the mysterious ways of audiences everywhere . . . participate in the performance and affect the quality."

confusing activity going on all around the immediate playing area. This pressure and distraction tends to interfere with the quality of the actor's characterization. The stage does have its share of backstage turmoil; but the playing area proper, and the major proportion of the vast theater, are hushed in silence and sympathetic concentration as the play progresses. In the film and television studio, on the other hand, constantly moving camera mounts, restless "boom mikes" (overhanging microphones), floor managers and assistants with cue-cards and hand signals, "cable pullers" (assistants handling the machinery connected with the movie or television cameras), lighting engineers, and stagehands are in constant motion everywhere on the set except in the immediate area in view of the cameras.

Less tangible, perhaps, yet more adversely influential, is the overall purpose behind the film or television production: it is created to appeal to the masses. The pictorial media involve great cost which is compensated for by their widespread circulation--in the nation's theaters or over millions of home television receivers. The content, and the form in which the production is presented, is developed with a view to reaching (by attracting) the greatest number of people possible--including the very young and the very old, the rich and the poor, the cultured and the crude. This leveling-off process undoubtedly takes its toll in the quality and depth of the production. The legitimate stage, in contrast, caters to the more cultured and critical, and so tends to

provide matter suited to this more refined and discriminating audience. The ever-present danger in filming classics is that the great works will be tampered with in an attempt to clarify their delicate nuances of insight lest the mass audience find parts of the production "obscure." The respective audiences have far less enervating influences upon the art of the stage than upon the art of the motion pictures and television.

Filmed productions have the added artistic hazard of being produced intermittently and not in sequence; scenes are photographed according to requirements of weather conditions, casting, stage setting restrictions, and "re-takes" (the re-shooting of a scene or sequence in order to obtain the most acceptable film recording of the scene). The tensions of emotions and actions are sustained with more difficulty, and involve more artificiality than the continuous stage production.

Television production offers further special problems of restriction, beyond those inherent in all the various photographic media. One seriously limiting factor is the size of the viewing screen for which the production is intended. Television sets have cathode-ray tubes (which is the major component of the viewing screen itself) ranging from ten inches wide to about twenty-eight inches. The average size (as of 1958) is the twenty-one-inch screen. This means that pictures transmitted from the studios and received on the home television set will be twenty-one inches wide. It is obvious that in this small viewing area elaborate décor in

settings will be lost to the eye; and when more than three persons are on the screen together they become too small to be readily identifiable. This greatly limits the quality and amount of detail possible in television staging and production. Partly because of this restriction, and partly because of the close-ups possible with special camera lenses, television (and to a certain extent, movies as well) has come to depend primarily on close, depth-study of individuals--their facial expressions and gestures as manifesting their deeper character--rather than on lavish spectacular staging. Intimacy has replaced scope in television.

For productions of Shakespeare this can be a fortuitous limitation. Shakespeare, after all, is a "poetic dramatist."[6] In Mark Van Doren's phrase, "Shakespeare is for the ear, not the eye."[7] The essence of the play is embodied in the poetry rather than in physical action or staging. Television is thus naturally akin to Shakespeare with its greater ability to highlight the individual person rather than many people together or a large expensive setting. The latter has been the bane of many legitimate theater stagings of the Elizabethan classics.

> We see this [grandeur imposed by the stage's production art] in the fashionable overproduction of Shakespeare's drama, in which the settings, born of the misty universalism of Gordon Craig, tower over the actors and swathe Shakespeare's intensely immediate human drama in a universal fog. And in acting,

---

[6] W. L. Phelps, "Shakespeare on the Modern Stage," Twentieth Century Theatre (..., [ca. 1918]), p. 101.

[7] Mark Van Doren, "Shakespeare Without Words," The Private Reader: Selected Articles and Reviews (New York, 1942), p. 302

> the results tend to be the kind of attitudinizing and over-precise elocutionary delivery of Shakespeare's lines that vitiate performances by Maurice Evans and by many German actors who play 'unser Shakespeare' as though he were Schiller.[8]

Television has presented a number of Shakespeare plays (Hamlet and Othello were mentioned earlier, pp. 84-85). Criticism has been mixed, but always well-founded. One critic[9] believed that "the production of Macbeth underlined the fact that there is a direct aesthetic relationship between dialogue and setting. Shakespeare's high style is most effective with simple sets." Commenting on this same point (with regard to a spring, 1953, presentation by Evans), another critic noted:

> The Hamlet production also pointed out one of the specific pitfalls of dealing with Shakespearean spectacle on the tiny television screen. If there is a law about staging for the new medium it seems to be this: on television, background clutter is poison to complex drama, and especially to the plays of Shakespeare with his temptation to elegance. The genius of the medium is its selectivity of focal points for the combined perception of eye and ear; the line of action must be clear; the form of speech, unblurred by visual distraction.[10]

The same critic points out how the Othello production on television, while it did not come out well at all, still possessed some significant high points: "The action came out cleanly against simple background of wall and arch forms that let the words and

---

[8]Gassner, p. 61.

[9]Claude E. Jones, "Imperial Theme--Macbeth on Television," Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, IX (Spring 1955), 294.

[10]Marvin Rosenberg, "Shakespeare on TV: An Optimistic Survey," Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, IX (Winter 1954), 168-169; the following quotation is from p. 171.

the actors' movements carry the weight of the tragedy. Furniture and other properties were at a functional minimum, so the stage area was left free without looking bare. . . . The crowd scenes were well handled; groups moving through the viewing area emphasized the central action, but did not distract from it."

The staging limitations mentioned have, in addition, the problem of keeping proper orientation of actors and respective cameras. On the stage, actors must in general face the audience area of the theater. In television, actors' movements must be so planned that the significant moves and gestures will be in precisely the proper place for a pre-determined camera to "shoot" the action. Similarly, the factor of proper lighting must be carefully planned relative to the actors and the cameras. Finally, the microphone placements must be strategically placed to pick up the actors' spoken lines without casting shadows from the overhead lights and without entering the cameras' framed areas of the television picture. Each of these factors--the cameras, microphones, and lights--has a definite influence on the details of stage movement and staging; they may also determine the impracticability or impossibility of some desired scenes or of some special treatment (by way of special effects with lighting or cameras). The final dramatic product is therefore partially determined by these factors proper to television production.

Television programming schedules and facilities offer further limitations on the scope and quality of dramatic production on this

medium. The television industry is engaged in hourly programming throughout the day and the week. The great preparations necessary for a successful telecast demand that large crews and a great amount of space and facilities be utilized not only in on-the-air presentation but likewise in the pre-planning and rehearsal phases. It is immediately evident that daily television programming limits the time and space and talent that may be expended on any one program. Rehearsal space, and studio space, is so restricted that few network television centers (where all dramatic telecasts originate in this country) can supply more than a few hours of rental in the on-the-air studio. These studios, while large, are not of the gigantic dimensions of film soundstages; they permit a limited number of stage sets (three would be a fair average). Space limitations also restrict the size and number of props; and time restrictions again limit the detail that may be worked into any given prop or setting. Studio facilities must often be shared with adjoining studios in production, once more limiting the technical facilities at the disposal of a production group, and thus influencing the final dramatic work.

Rigorous schedules, precision-timed and often abbreviated because of unexpected circumstances, prohibit the actors, directors, and producers from spending the time they might wish to perfect their dramatic production. The amount of time available for the on-the-air telecast of the drama is also rigorously mathematic. The play must fill the time allotted and no more; if it should run

a bit long, it will be terminated precisely at the time contracted for, and will be cut off the air. The time contracted for must fall into thirty-, sixty-, ninety-, or one-hundred-and-twenty-minute units; the drama must be adapted to fit this unit.

The industry's continuous programming demands great quantity of program matter in order to fill the telecast day through all the weeks of the year. This matter is decided upon and developed by the networks' staffs and crews. Because of the unceasing heavy demand on their creative talents and energies, the quality of much of their programming suffers proportionately.

All of these restrictions are factors which at least indirectly influence the choice of the dramatic works to be televised, as well as the final on-the-air production of them. When a classic work such as Shakespeare's Richard II is elected for television presentation, it is under these handicaps--together with whatever advantages the medium has to offer--that the commitment is made. The question of the present study is: can such a classic be presented on this demanding medium without substantial distortion of the original work of art?

One final clarification is in order, before the above question is studied in detail. "Live" television production presents a number of other elements which influence dramatic work. Some of these elements have already been suggested by the general remarks above on television in general.

"Live" television refers to a television presentation that is

directly transmitted out over the airwaves simultaneously with its production in the studio. It is contrasted with recorded television which, as the term implies, is produced in the studio and recorded (on celluloid film or on magnetic tape) for later delayed transmission over the air. Recorded television offers many of the advantages of regular motion picture films, such as the scope of scenery possible for use, costuming, staging, special effects, etc. Each of these advantages is lost in "live" telecasting.

"Live" television production is restricted from the nature of a continuous production; there is no opportunity for "re-taking" any errors in acting or staging. Stage sets must be carefully planned for progressive, continuous use throughout the play; actors, cameras, and microphone equipment must be able to follow the action from one scene to the next, without any need for radically changing sets or for traveling across the entire studio from one stage area to another far distant from the first. The number of sets and their locale are determined by the studio facilities. The number of sets is usually three; the locale must invariably be an indoor scene (unless special effects are employed, such as artificial "rear screen projection" of a scene--used in conjunction with standard indoor studio properties). The sequence of sets must be such that actors can move from one to another without any major costume changes; otherwise, "cover scenes" must be inserted to allow time for such changes. The costuming and staging must be practicable for "non-stop" performance. All of these considerations

affect the structure of the dramatic presentation.[11]

Not unlike the legitimate theater and films, television demands that the actions of the players be pre-planned with painstaking specifications so that proper lighting, microphones, and camera positions be adequately prepared. The problem of camera positions is a critical one in "live" television, since once the drama has begun there is no more opportunity to revise the placement of cameras in and around the playing area, nor to modify radically their angles of "shooting" or their lenses.[12]

The drama may also undergo unavoidable changes when the "live" telecast is in progress. Such occasions would arise from errors during the course of the play, which would introduce changes in the prepared script (in the case of classic works, the scripts would be adapted from the original text). These occasions might be any of the following: the actors' forgetting lines or missing stage movements (once on the air, there is no possibility of stopping to retrieve a lost line); camera positions and angles and special photographic effects might be interfered with by unexpected conditions in the studio (such as a stagehand's crossing

---

[11]Cf. Irwin Smith's comments on cover scenes, and the "law of re-entry": Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse: A Modern Reconstruction in Text and Drawings (New York, 1956), pp. 113-115.

[12]There is, of course, the opportunity for minor adjustments or changes on the air, since the director is in constant communication with the entire production staff and engineering crew during a telecast. But basic positions and movements of cameras cannot change even then. There simply is not time for detailed "testing" and experimentation for modifying shots while on the air.

between the camera and the playing area it is to cover, or a piece of property or scenery from a preceding scene which blocks the "shooting" area of the camera); the microphone suspended from the boom may be too high to pick up clearly the voices of those speaking, or the actors may walk too rapidly out of its range before it can follow them; the stagehands' rapid, silent changes of properties and lights might involve a mishandling of some object, or the misplacing of it on the set; or a wrong light switch might be thrown in the darkness and tension of the on-the-air operation. In a word, the margin of error in "live" television production is narrow indeed. George Schaefer, producer-director of the Hallmark Hall of Fame television series, comments: "Of course, 5,000 things can go wrong in a TV production. But if only 1,000 of them happen, the show can still be a great success."[13]

Nevertheless, in dramatic work there are some advantages of "live" television over recorded television. The "live" uninterrupted production permits a continuous flow of action and emotion for the performer, and thereby approaches the power and impact of the theater performance; the actor is better able to sustain the atmosphere and tensions of the drama (some of which may be negated, however, by the distracting production turmoil surrounding him in the studio). There is also a sense of immediacy both for the performer and for the members of the audience; there is at least indirect

---

[13]George Schaefer, quoted in Newsweek, XLIX (February 25, 1957), 66.

instantaneous contact between the actors and audience as the performance is presented. This, too, supplies some of the "electric vitality" or dynamism found in the legitimate theater performance.

Television, "live" or recorded, brings the audience right into the action, next to or in front of the performers. Katherine Cornell points out: "If anything, there is more truth in TV drama than in the theater. The audience is right there about 3 inches in front of your nose. Anything false shows up immediately, I had to tone down my gestures and facial expressions by at least 50 per cent. But a good actress ought to be even better on television."[14] Similarly, Maurice Evans has noted that "the key to television acting . . . is what not to do. A twitch of the lips might destroy the desired impression, a lift of the eyebrows might kill the lines; the camera holds a microscope rather than a mirror up to the actor. . . . As for myself, I think in terms of a twenty-one-inch screen rather than a thirty-two-foot stage."[15] And Robert Harridge comments that in television "we use a lot of close-ups--working very intensely--and this is really in a sense the surface level, but also a very deep level, too. The human face, very closely photographed, conveys an immediate impression but it can also reveal the soul. . . . Beyond the surface level, we try to get into,

---

[14]Quoted in Newsweek, XLVII (April 9, 1956), 104.

[15]In an interview by Richard F. Shepard, quoted in The New York Times, November 20, 1955, sect. 2, p. 11.

let's say, the basic action, the main action or ethical conflict. This is at the deepest level of the play."[16]

The drama on television is a new type in which the action cannot be predominantly physical (as it can be on the large stage or in the film) but must rather be psychological; both sight and sound serve to give overt expression to the operations of the mind. The necessary intimacy of the medium creates a new approach to dramatic work, even if the drama be adapted from a classic.[17]

---

[16]This and the following statements taken from an edited version of a symposium held at Teachers College, Columbia University by the Committee on the Study of Television, Radio, and Film of the National Council of Teachers of English, January 15, 1955. Included in the symposium were: Robert Harridge, producer for "Camera Three" television series; Louis Forsdale, associate professor of English, Teachers College, Columbia University; Martin Manulis, producer for "Climax!" television series; Theodore Apstein, script editor for "General Electric Theater," and assistant professor, School of Dramatic Arts, Columbia University. Excerpts here quoted are from "Adapting Literary Materials to Television--Part I," ed. Louis Forsdale, EJ, XLIV (December 1955), 513-520.

[17]Cf. Charles A. Seipman, Radio, Television, and Society (New York, 1950), p. 347; Howard Becknell, "Radio Drama, 1935-1945: Television Drama, 1945-1950: A Study of Trends in the Use of Dialogue," Unpublished Master's Thesis (University of Indiana, Bloomington, 1951), p. 37. Cf. also Jack Gould's syndicated The New York Times column for April 3, 1956 (source: Louisville Courier-Journal, sect. 2, p. 2, edition of April 3, 1956); Gould criticizes the telecast of "The Barretts of Wimpole Street":

"The transition to TV tended to accentuate the work's weaknesses. . . . But as can happen so easily in a medium of swiftly changing close-ups, the sheer intimacy of the camera tended to put chief emphasis on the psychologist narrative rather than on the larger enveloping mood.

"'The Barretts' simply is not a drama to be separated into parts and examined in close-up. It needs a proscenium arch to put its romance in perspective." [And yet, apropos of close-ups for effective reaction shots:] "when Browning spoke, it was a pity that the camera did not focus more often on her face."

Martin Manulis notes: "I think you aren't contributing to the author, if when you adapt for another medium, you don't do something to recognize the demands of the new medium." Mr. Harridge adds: "I think the whole thing depends on what you consider the television medium to be, and I consider it to be an art form, not merely a communicative form. Therefore, what you are really doing is translating from one language to another. . . . [Y]our mediums are different. Limited time as such is necessarily a limiting factor, and to me the problem which is created is an artistic one."[18]

Such are the major qualifying factors of "live" and recorded television production. In general, all adaptations of classic drama to this medium are affected in some way--for better or for worse--by these restrictions and advantages of television facilities and production.

In particular, the critical comments about specific Shakespearean performances on television may here be cited, as a means of introducing Chapter IV of this study. Critics and actors have pointed out television's affinity to Shakespearean drama as a whole.

> Dramatic writing, in being cinematically employed, could become Shakespearean again. . . . And symbolism could become dramatically effective to a greater degree than it has been on the stage. The use of symbols as an integral element of cinematic narration has long been a remarkable feature of film art.
> . . . . . .
> Nor is the view that a screenplay has many more scenes than a play and is therefore choppy as description and narration a valid argument against the possibilities of literary values

---

[18]Forsdale, "Adapting Literary Materials to Television--Part I," EJ, XLIV (December 1955), 518.

> in screenwriting. Not only is Shakespearean or Elizabethan drama multi-screened, but even a tightly knit one-set realistic play is actually composed of many short scenes whenever the work is theatrically effective.[19]

Maurice Evans, Shakespearean actor and producer, feels that "television has a little affinity to the apron stage of Shakespeare, where the actors actually got out into the audience. . . . I'm sure that Shakespeare did not plan his plays for the nineteenth-century picture-frame stage with its declaiming and oratory."[20] Marvin Rosenberg likewise looks to television as a very suitable medium for Shakespeare's work:

> His [Shakespeare's] work can be made to fit the television screen admirably; and, for modern audiences, it can even gain impact through the intimacy of the new form. It is worth remembering here that in the relatively small theatres for which Shakespeare wrote--even in the outdoor Globe--the audience was pretty close to the action--perhaps even much closer than we used to think, if Leslie Hotson's recent arena-staging theories have any validity. Many scenes played far forward on the platform--or perhaps centrally at Whitehall--were virtual close-ups. This was especially true when the rapidly succeeding scenes were played in different stage areas, which became for the moment specialized locales cut off from the rest of the acting space. The audience then focused on localized action, something the television camera can do now for viewers. In the close relationship TV establishes, a brilliant clarity can often be given to the music of the verse as well as to its meaning; and the latter can be illuminated by subtle, intimate stage business, legitimately suggested by the lines, that sharpens both the stage action and the characterization. Beyond this, scene can follow scene with the speed Shakespeare was working for.
>
> This is what television <u>can</u> do. In the last year [1952-1953 season] it came a long way toward learning how to do it."[21]

---

[19]Gassner, pp. 583, 582.

[20]Maurice Evans, quoted by Richard F. Shepard, <u>The New York Times</u>, November 20, 1955, sect. 2, p. 11.

[21]<u>Rosenberg, pp. 166-167; relative to Leslie Hotson's theories</u>

Claude E. Jones echoes these remarks: "Shakespeare's theatre provided a highly fluid staging area so divided that one scene followed another with no need for long pauses between scenes, or even acts. The modern [television] camera allows, however, even greater freedom and flow."[22]

On the other hand, this same freedom and mobility can present a definite temptation to over-use of the electronic cameras, as is evidenced in specific productions. Alice Griffin has pointed out how, in the 1953-1954 season (during which King Lear, Hamlet, Richard II, and Macbeth were produced for television), the "cameras are still too 'busy,' roving during the major speeches as if the producers were fearful to let Shakespeare's words speak for themselves."[23] In this critic's mind, the "medium reduced the stature of the plays to that of the 'action-packed' television script rather than living up to the greatness of the works." On this head, at least with reference to the Hamlet production (one of the first Shakespearean dramas on television), Rosenberg agrees: "A device favored by the play's producers (Hallmark Theatre) was that of looking at the actors through tricky points of view--from beyond a window, through a fire, etc.--and, although this was an interesting technical novelty, it had the disadvantage of reminding the viewer

---

cf. his "Shakespeare's Arena," SR, LXI (Summer 1953), 347-361.

[22]Claude E. Jones, p. 294.

[23]Griffin, p. 63.

of what an interesting technical novelty this technical novelty was."[24] Margaret Webster offers the same criticism:

> But to the movie-makers language is officially known as 'wordage.' The art of the camera is the art of action and the eye; its objective is to find the short cuts which avoid 'wordage.' Nor is it yet considered possible, at least in the television medium, to hold the viewer with words alone. The visual angle must continually change. You must cut to a listener's reaction, or shift to a long shot, or come back to the speaker with a camera focused down the back of his neck. This, supposedly, achieves variety; it keeps things moving; it obviates the peril of being static and talky. But Shakespeare is never static, for the very reason that he talks so much; it is the talk itself which moves. Let us hope that TV will rapidly outgrow these self-imposed limitations.[25]

Television is but a medium. While it is to a certain extent a new art form, it nonetheless remains a medium of communication--for traditional works of art as well as for newly composed material. As a medium it cannot interfere with the content or tone (the meaning and "feeling") of that which it is communicating. In so far as it distracts from or distorts the material being presented, it fails in its intended purpose to communicate. And, of course, in so far as the medium calls attention to itself and modifies the structure of the drama being presented, this drama suffers proportionately--even so much as to cease being a dramatic work at all, but only a vehicle for experimenting with electronic gadgetry.

Further comments on the use and abuse of electronic equipment, as well as discussion of staging techniques and the editing of an

---

[24]Rosenberg, p. 169

[25]Webster, pp. 300-301.

original text for adaptation to the new medium, will be considered in the following chapter on the television presentation of *King Richard II*.

CHAPTER IV

RICHARD II ON TELEVISION

In this chapter a comparative analysis will be made between the television production of Richard II and Shakespeare's original version.

At the outset a few clarifications are necessary. First, the integrity of the actors' performances is not here called into question. For the purpose of the present study, it is presumed that theirs have been authentic interpretations of the various characters portrayed in Shakespeare's lines. Their abilities and techniques of acting do not enter into the present study which concerns itself primarily with the original text lines as retained, modified, or deleted for television.[1] Secondly, the problem of this thesis may here be reiterated: it proposes an analysis of the television production in order to determine the success or failure of Maurice Evans and his company in capturing and communicating the problem of the play, the character portrayal, and the high points of

[1]For a treatment of the interpretation of Richard's part, cf. Joan Buechner Compton, "Acting Technique of Maurice Evans in the Television Production of Richard II," Unpublished Master's Thesis (#7700), (Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1955).

dramatic emphasis through staging and imagery--as Shakespeare conceived them.[2] Thirdly, the procedure will involve a scene-by-scene comparative analysis of the materials involved in these two versions of Richard II: on the one hand, the original text of Shakespeare (the 1597 and 1623 editions)[3] accompanied by the army of commentators and critics, and on the other hand, a duplicate copy of the actual television production script together with a kinescope film recording of the original telecast.[4]

The analysis of the television production of the play will concern itself initially with the overall structure of the play--the number of acts, scenes, and scene-changes. It will then study the characters to determine the quantity and the quality, or content, of the original lines which were omitted in staging the

---

[2]What Shakespeare had intended has been determined by the concensus of critics' commentaries, as treated in Chapter II above.

[3]Since the television adaptors may legitimately have chosen from any of the accepted editions of the original Shakespeare text --without implying any limitations of television in such a choice-- discrepancies among the various texts will be prescinded from. As long as the television script incorporates words, lines, and stage directions found in any accepted text of the original, it will be classified simply as "no modification of the original version" for television. The three texts referred to in this study are: (a)1597 Q_1 edition of Henry N. Hudson, Shakespeare's King Richard the Second with Introduction, and Notes Explanatory and Critical (Boston, 1879); (b) "Globe" edition of George B. Harrison, King Richard II, in Major Plays and the Sonnets (New York, 1948); (c) 1623 F_1 edition of Helge Kökeritz, Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies--A Facsimile Edition of the First Folio, (New Haven, 1954).

[4]Cf. Appendix III for details of the author's method of determining the actual production script, as verified in the kinescope film recording of the television presentation; p. 189.

television version, and the effect of these modifications ("cuts" or deletions) upon the characters and plot finally portrayed on the television screen. Further, since Shakespeare is not only the text but also the visual production of this text, the staging of the telecast will be the next point of study--scenery, properties, and television production techinques--to try to determine their effect on the play's flow of movement and its meaning. The adapted script will be analyzed to discover what changes were wrought on the poetry and imagery created by Shakespeare, particularly the poetry and images relative to plot and character portrayal. The present chapter will close with an estimate of the effectiveness of Evans' company in producing Shakespeare's Richard II for television.

THE PLAY'S PLOT AND STRUCTURE

The television version reduces the play from five acts to but three acts. In itself this is not a major point, since the plays originally had no such sharply demarcated boundaries as this classical division into five separate acts. As Margaret Webster has pointed out, three acts would be quite natural, especially for this particular play, with one act-pause coming after the scene at Gaunt's death and the other after Richard is taken at Flint Castle.[5] The television version has adopted this first act-pause, which in the original text occurs at the end of Act II.1; Evans'

---

[5]Webster, p. 69.

production has also incorporated this second natural act-pause, which in the original version comes at the end of Act III.iii.

The arrangement of the scenes which fall within the compass of these three revised act-units, however, does not correspond perfectly to Shakespeare's arrangement of the scenes. For the sake of continuity, or for television production demands, some scenes have been dropped, others "cut" or abbreviated, still others re-arranged or telescoped one into another; many scenes have been left virtually intact, and but a few have been added or rewritten. (These latter interpolations introduce into the play new elements created especially for this television version.)

For the television production, four scenes of the original drama have been completely deleted (I.ii; II.iv; V.ii; V.iii). Five other scenes have been heavily edited by deletion of long passages of dialogue (I.iii; II.i; II.iii; III.iv; IV.i; V.vi). One scene has been entirely corrupted (V.iv); in it, the few lines retained are entirely wrenched from their original meaning, and the character of Bolingbroke is grossly misrepresented (this scene received unique treatment in the adaptation for television; the scene was twisted in such a way that a crucial part of the plot and characterization was badly warped). The remaining scenes are faithful reproductions of Shakespeare's original drama; they are edited passim but lightly (I.i; I.iv; II.ii; III.i; III.ii; III.iii; V.i; V.vi).

Before considering the quantitative line structure of each scene, it will be well to note the overall distribution of lines

found in both versions. The original text of Shakespeare (i.e., a "composite reading" from the 1597 Quarto, from the Globe edition, and from the 1623 Facsimile edition) supplies 2,780 lines for Richard II. The television adaptation deletes 1,248 1/2 of these lines, and adds 33 original lines; the final edited television text thus gives 1,565 1/2 lines in its production script for Richard II.

The following table catalogues the editing done in each individual scene.

TABLE I

QUANTITATIVE EDITING OF ORIGINAL LINES FOR TELEVISION ADAPTATION

Original		Television Adaptation	
Scene No.	Number of Lines	Amount of Editing	Revised TV Scene No.
I.i	205	82 lines deleted 4 words changed	TV-I.i
I.ii	74	Entire scene deleted	----
I.iii	304	73 1/2 lines deleted 2 lines added 1 phrase changed 1 word added	TV-I.i (cont'd.) & TV-I.ii
I.iv	64	4 words deleted 2 words changed 3 words added	TV-I.iii
II.i	300	130 lines deleted 7 half-lines deleted 11 words changed 1 phrase changed 1 line added	TV-I.iv

TABLE I (continued)

QUANTITATIVE EDITING OF ORIGINAL LINES
FOR TELEVISION ADAPTATION

Original		Television adaptation	
Scene no.	Number of lines	Amount of editing	Revised TV scene no.
II.ii	149	(Television divided into 2 parts: ll. 1-40; 41-149.)	
	(##1-40:)	25 lines deleted 4 half-lines deleted 1 word added 2 half-lines transposed	TV-II.i
	(##41-149:)	44 1/2 lines deleted 1 line changed 1 phrase changed 3 words changed 1 line added	TV-II.iii
II.iii	171	(Television divided into two parts: ll. 4-50, 57-67; and 1-3, 51-56, 68-171.)	
	(##4-etc.:)	35 lines deleted 2 half-lines deleted 1 line added 1 word replaced by phrase 3 lines transposed	TV-II.ii
	(##1-etc.:)	34 lines deleted 4 1/2 lines transposed 1 word deleted 1 line changed 2 lines added	TV-II.iv
II.iv	24	Entire scene deleted	----
III.i	44	24 1/2 lines deleted 20 1/2 lines transposed to TV-IV.i) 7 words change plural to sing.	TV-III.i
III.ii	218	42 1/2 lines deleted 5 lines added	TV-II.v

TABLE I (continued)

QUANTITATIVE EDITING OF ORIGINAL LINES
FOR TELEVISION ADAPTATION

Original		Television adaptation	
Scene no.	Number of lines	Amount of editing	Revised TV scene no.
		1 line changed 7 words changed	
III.iii	209	31 1/2 lines deleted 1 word changed 2 phrases changed 24 lines deleted 2 lines added 2 phrases added 1 word changed	TV-II.vi & TV-II.vii
III.iv	107	6 lines deleted 52 1/2 lines deleted 1 word added	TV-II.i & TV-III.ii
IV.i	334	147 1/2 lines deleted 1 word deleted 4 words changed 1 line added 4 lines transposed to later 1 phrase transposed within line (-20 1/2 lines added: transposed from III.i)	TV-III.i
V.i	102	26 lines deleted 2 words changed 2 words & 1 phrase transposed within their respective lines 14 lines transposed to later in scene 2 words added	TV-III.ii
V.ii	117	Entire scene deleted	----
V.iii	146	Entire scene deleted	----

TABLE I (continued)

QUANTITATIVE EDITING OF ORIGINAL LINES
FOR TELEVISION ADAPTATION

Original		Television adaptation	
Scene no.	Number of lines	Amount of editing	Revised TV scene no.
V.iv	11	8 lines deleted 15 lines added (3 original lines remaining--grossly changed from context)	TV-III.iv
V.v	119	6 1/2 lines deleted (from portion used) 31 1/2 lines deleted (from rest of scene) 2 phrases changed 3 words changed	TV-III.iii & TV-III.v
V.vi	52	4 lines deleted (from portion used) 29 lines deleted (from rest of scene) 2 words changed 1 word deleted	TV-III.vi

Not incorporated into the above table are the following modifications of the original text. Of the words changed for the adaptation, twelve are "Hereford"--which becomes "Bolingbroke" in the revised version; some speeches retained from the original undergo a rearrangement of the character(s) speaking them (II.i, ll. 238-276; II.ii, one line; II.iii, one line; III.i, two lines; V.v, one line); in II.iii.152 York repeats "I" thrice, as he repeats "I'll" in line 168, both times for dramatic effect; in III.

iv (the Queen) and in V.i (King Richard) there is a slight slip of tongue in enunciating a phrase.

Before analyzing the significance of the editing noted in the table above, it will be helpful to enumerate the adapted television scenes in their sequential order, together with the original scenes or parts of scenes that go to make them up.

TABLE II

TELEVISION SEQUENCE OF ADAPTED SCENES

Adaptation's enumeration	Original scene no.	Original line numbers (plus comments)
TV-I.i	I.i I.iii	1-197 134-243
TV-I.ii	I.iii	244-304
TV-I.iii	I.iv	1-64 (in toto)
TV-I.iv	II.i	Passim through entire scene; but with heavy deleting, and rearrangement of lines and speakers in ll.238-276.
TV-II.i	III.iv II.ii	1-23 1-40
TV-II.ii	II.iii	59-67, 20-21, 41-50
TV-II.iii	II.ii	41-149
TV-II.iv	II.iii	1-3, 51-55 (rearranged), 78-80, 82-171
TV-II.v	III.ii	1-218
TV-II.vi	III.iii	1-61
TV-II.vii-A TV-II.vii-B	III.iii	62-183 184-209

TABLE II (continued)

TELEVISION SEQUENCE OF ADAPTED SCENES

Adaptation's enumeration	Original scene no.	Original line numbers (plus comments)
TV-III.i	IV.i III.i	1-320 (deleting lines 2-106) 2-8, 14-21, 28-30, 31-32, 35
TV-III.ii	III.iv V.i III.iv	29-84 (deleting lines 37-55, 57-64, 75-80, 84-101): 22 lines used 7-8, 16-102 102-107
TV-III.iii	V.v	1-41
TV-III.iv	(V.iv	2, 9-10) BUT scene rewritten, shifting original meaning from context.
TV-III.v	V.v	67-113
TV-III.vi	V.vi	30-52

An analysis of the scene content catalogued in these two statistical tables will bring out the significance of deletions, additions, and other modifications introduced into the television adaptation.

In the television production, Act I.i incorporates the essential material of the original I.i and I.iii. The adaptation centers around the argument between Mowbray and Bolingbroke, with King Richard capriciously determining judgment. In telescoping the action into one scene a faster pace is achieved as far as the general plot development goes. And by this condensation Richard appears on the scene and immediately dominates it, thus avoiding

the long delay of Richard's prominence in the play.

However, in the lines deleted, the adaptation loses an entire scene with Gaunt and the Duchess. In these original seventy-four lines the divine right theme is struck when Gaunt explains to the Duchess of Gloucester that he cannot call to account the king (who is believed to have caused the murder of the Duke of Gloucester). Hence Richard's involvement in the death is "the fault that we cannot correct," so "put we our quarrel to the will of Heaven." Gaunt explains that:

> God's is the quarrel; for God's substitute,
> His deputy annointed in His sight,
> Hath caused his death; the which, if wrongfully,
> Let Heaven revenge; for I may never lift
> An angry arm against His minister. (I.ii.37-41)

By deleting this scene the television adaptors remove an early, unmistakable signpost to one entire level of the play's significance. At the same time, they render less understandable Gaunt's awkward position in treating with Richard about this or any other point of dispute or correction--in Gaunt's eyes Richard is divinely appointed and his actions may be appealed only before God.

Naturally because of restricted staging the television production must forego all parts of the original scenes which involve the actual lists on the field of tournament. So the earlier parts of scene iii are deleted, while the latter portions are joined with scene i. The only loss is some of the traditional pomp and formalities of the occasion; the plot proper is little affected by the deletion.

The final speeches of I.iii in the original become, in the television version, TV-I.ii.[6] The mood of the scene, as well as the characters, has changed. Television has chosen to make this an isolated, integral unit by creating a departure scene at the river-front or seaside. This modification does not interfere with the plot development, and it may even serve to highlight the close relationship between Gaunt and Bolingbroke.

TV-I.iii corresponds to the original I.iv _in toto_.

TV-I.iv is built out of lines from Shakespeare's II.i. (As pointed out in Chapter II, there may be little significance ascribed to the numbering of the acts; this enumeration came after Shakespeare's composition of the plays and does not affect the sequence of the individual "units of action" or scenes.) In the lines deleted, only Gaunt's poetizing suffers; the basic content of his speeches remains intact. York's speeches are also edited rather heavily; the deletions limit our full understanding of his character, but the general characteristics of York's hand-wringing, ambivalent position still emerge from the speeches as adapted. The final lines of the scene, with word of Bolingbroke's return, are substantially the same in content and significance for the play. As in the original, this hushed but excited conversation brings the note of counter-action into the drama: the rebellious faction

---

[6]Hereafter, to distinguish from the act-scene enumeration of Shakespeare's original version, the references to the television adaptation will prefix the letters TV before act and scene numbers.

is about to make its move against the do-nothing poet-king.

Presumably for the sake of clarity and for ease of identification, the adaptors have seen fit to change any parallel names (i.e., "Henry" or "Hereford") to the consistent nomenclature of "Bolingbroke"; this they do twelve times in the course of the play. This modification eliminates a source of possible confusion for some of the mass audience watching the television presentation.

At this point the television adaptation begins to juggle the scene sequence. For TV-II.i, the telecast incorporates the original III.iv (lines 1-23) with II.ii (lines 1-40). This serves only to further delineate the Queen's character and disposition; it leaves the gardener sequence in the original III.iv for special insertion later in the play, without the possibly distracting material involving the Queen and the ladies of her court. These appear instead in the present television scene, TV-II.i; they only serve to expand the characterization of the Queen and her ladies in waiting. In the lines deleted from II.ii, Bushy loses his part in the play.

II.ii is interrupted in the television adaptation, in order to insert portions of II.iii. Essentially this involves no change of the basic outline of the play; it does serve to increase the tempo or movement of the drama by means of contrasting scenes. From the garden where word has just come of Bolingbroke's return to England, the scene shifts to Bolingbroke and his army. The masculine preparations for moving on to reclaim Bolingbroke's rights and

possessions serve as a foil for the feminine concern with the news as it is carried to the Queen's garden. It is to this garden that the next scene of the adaptation returns. Generally speaking, the overall result of the editing is a quickening of the pace of the play; the contrasting scenes serve also as a dramatic highlighting of the action on both sides--Bolingbroke's and the Queen's. As for editing within these portions of the original scenes, the scene with Bolingbroke and Northumberland and York remains quite intact.

TV-II.iii is the original's final lines (41-149) of II.ii. The significant deletions are few. Four and one-half lines of one of York's speeches are dropped; in the original they had served to point up the equality of the conflict in York's eyes, and thereby accounted for his indecision when treating with Richard and Bolingbroke:

> . . . Both are my kinsmen:
> The one is my sovereign, whom both my oath
> And duty bids defend; the other, again,
> Is my near kinsman, whom the King hath wrong'd,
> Whom conscience and my kindred bids to right. (II.ii.111-115)

In the first line York explains the initial basis for his double allegiance: blood relationship to both men. In the second and third lines he underscores the divine right principle which provides the political occasion of the play (and which is the concept that Richard entertains, on which he falls back in all of his substitutes for decision and action). In the final lines York points out that, while he is bound to Richard out of respect for the divinely appointed ruler, nevertheless the truth and justice of

this particular case falls on the side of Bolingbroke--who has been "wrong'd, / Whom conscience and my kindred bids to right." Such an understanding of the conflict between Richard and Bolingbroke throws much light on the character of each. Richard is so much enamored of his God-like position of authority that he can do no wrong; he can act by caprice and there is no recourse for his subjects except to God by prayer. Thus Richard encases himself in the luminous mist of divinity, apart from the realities and problems of the day-to-day world which he is supposed to rule as God's regent. At the same time, Bolingbroke emerges as a threat to this king's divine-right dissociation from reality; Bolingbroke comes forth with truth and justice on his side. Thus he becomes not the antagonist, but rather the occasion for Richard's wrestling with the whole question of divine right. In view of all this--and remembering that the play deals more with Richard the man vs. Richard the king-poet, than with Richard vs. Bolingbroke--the deletion of these lines of York are of great significance. Without such passages, brief though they be, the central problem of the play and its main lines of conflict and plot-development tend to become obscured or even warped. As less emphasis is placed on the righteousness of Bolingbroke's demands and on Richard's self-complacency as divinely appointed monarch, by so much does the play emerge as a merely physical struggle between a king and a would-be tyrant. The delicate psychological study of Richard's two-fold personality (as poet-king and as a thinking, feeling man) fuses with, until it is

absorbed by, a drama of "the good man against the bad man."

A harbinger of the outcome of this clash between Richard and Bolingbroke is lost when Green's lines (145-147) about York's initial opposition to Bolingbroke are deleted:

> Alas, poor Duke! the task he undertakes
> Is numbering the sands, and drinking oceans dry:
> Where one on his side fights, thousands will fly.
> (II.ii.145-147)

These lines also served (in the original) to give some indication of the thought and actions of Richard's subjects at large.

The action returns immediately to Bolingbroke's camp, by the simple expedient of taking up the original II.iii where it was left off earlier (in the adaptation this was TV-II.ii). Those lines are retained which identify the locale (ll. 1-3, 51-55). York enters, to treat with Bolingbroke about his illegal re-entry into the land. York's speed (e.g., ll. 87-88) carries with it the conviction that Bolingbroke is a traitor. The reason for branding him a traitor, of course, is that while under a six-year banishment he has nevertheless set foot on English soil before that time has elapsed. Therefore the reason for the charge of traitor is not (at least not in the original version) because of any unlawful demands for unwarranted rights--much less because of any intent to wrench the sceptre from Richard's hands in order to crown himself king. (This latter idea is initiated by Richard himself, in the battlement scene; as circumstances arrange themselves, Bolingbroke does eventually move onto the throne of England. Whether this was his initial intent or not is highly disputed. The commentators do not

believe this to be the case; their belief is warranted by the original text of the play. The adaptation, however, must be studied anew in itself.) York's lines are for the most part intact, as are Bolingbroke's.

Act II.iv of the original is entirely deleted in the television presentation. Another harbinger, foretelling Richard's downfall, is lost by the deletion of these twenty-four lines. The fact of the Welsh troops' defection further symbolizes the collapse of all the English troops and people. This collapse will be brought out in the coming act, however, so the loss does not affect the movement or plot of the play, except to deprive this earlier portion of the drama of its own undercurrent of impending collapse for Richard.

Shakespeare's III.ii (lines 1-218) becomes television's TV-II.v. Line changes are few and do not alter the characterizations or plot. This is a crucial scene; the adaptors did well to preserve its integrity. In it is the chief discovery of the play's action--where Richard is deserted and begins to despair of the crown. The fact that the original II.iv was entirely omitted in the television version, and that III.i is transposed to join IV.i as television's composite TV-III.i, causes the present scene (Richard's return from Ireland) to follow immediately upon the scene involving York and Bolingbroke wherein York is persuaded to join Bolingbroke in his claims for justice. Since it is made to follow immediately, does the present scene thereby supply powerful contrast and achieve

greater impact? York has defected in the last scene; in the adaptation this is now followed by the present scene in which Richard has just returned to English shores, only to learn that troops, people and even close associates (York, Bushy, Green, etc.) have forsaken him for the invader. Shakespeare's own arrangement of the action (whether the units of action be classified and enumerated as independent scenes or not) offers a stronger progressive build-up: the scene of York's defection is followed by the Welsh troop defection; and this is followed by III.i wherein Bushy, Bagot, and Green are with Bolingbroke, only to be condemned for their trickery ("caterpillars of the commonwealth" who lean with the changes of the political winds). Shakespeare's original scene sequence, then, is: (a) Bolingbroke and York, (b) Welsh troops, (a^1) Bushy, etc. and Bolingbroke, (c) Richard's return. In Richard's scene each of the preceding actions is recapitulated when news is brought to the king of the successive defections. As the television adaptation presents the scenes, (a) is followed immediately by (c). We learn of the other defections from "messengers" (as in the Greek tragedies); in the television version the news of activity "off-stage" is carried forward by this device alone. The audience does not see the action, but only hears of it through others. This would seem to be a weakness in the television production's adaptation.

Act III.iii of the original has been divided into three scenes (or, more correctly, into two scenes: TV-II.vi; TV-II.vii-A and TV-II.vii-B). What editing occurs involves longer flights of poetic

fancy; although the plot remains intact, the characterizations are modified in so far as they are dependent for manifestation upon the poetic passages deleted. The remainder of the original scene remains intact; it is replete with long lyric speeches which sustain the original characterizations.

The television adaptation at this point introduces an act-pause. Television then resumes with TV-III.i. This is paralleled in the original by IV.i (lines 107-320) and III.i (lines 2-8, 14-35), both of which scenes are telescoped into the single TV-III.i. This telescoping simplifies the sequence of action; it brings the scene of Bolingbroke's condemnation of Bagot together with the later action of the deposition of Richard. (In the original, Bagot is accompanied by Bushy and Green; not so in the trimmed television version.) At the same time, this telescoping process entirely deletes the opening of IV.i (lines 2-106), wherein Bolingbroke witnesses between Aumerle, Bagot, and their associates the mutual charges of complicity in Gloucester's death. Of significance in this editing is the deletion of lines 9-13, 22-27 of III.i and of lines 2-5, 86-90, 103-106 of IV.i. In these speeches Bolingbroke makes manifest his own innocence in the death of Gloucester (which was, after all, the reason for his own banishment by Richard). Likewise indicating Bolingbroke's guiltlessness in the death of Gloucester are the lines of Bagot (IV.i, lines 6 and 8-19) and those of Fitzwater and Percy (IV.i.33-40, 44-48, 78-82). On the other hand, Surrey stands up for Aumerle's innocence (IV.i.64-71). To

delete a crucial scene like this is to cover the conflicting testimonies surrounding the death of Gloucester.

In the original, these lines had shown both factions accusing each other and ignoring Bolingbroke, who is attempting to find out the truth. In a word, the action in this scene points rather conclusively to the utter innocence of Bolingbroke in Gloucester's death. This is important for an understanding of Bolingbroke's own character and hence of the plot itself. Since Bolingbroke in the original version appears to be innocent of Gloucester's death, he must have been banished unjustly and by the sheer caprice of Richard's rule. Further, while he was in exile, his father's estates were confiscated by Richard at Gaunt's death. What might Bolingbroke do in order to regain his rightful possessions as heir? Since all of England disapproved of Richard's neglect as king, Bolingbroke might be somehow justified in ignoring the command to banishment, in order to return to his homeland and restore his property to himself. Meanwhile, however, all England looks upon Bolingbroke as a deliverer and joins his forces. And Richard, true to character, immediately withers at the first hint of opposition; he delays and poetizes until it is almost too late; then he utterly collapses when time for final action arrives. Richard virtually pulls Bolingbroke up into the throne so that he himself can fall back and lament his unending grief as "sometime poet-king."

Whether such a construction of the main lines of the plot is wholly accurate depends upon the original text. Shakespeare's text

appears to justify this proposed summary of the play's action. The television adaptation, however, precludes any such construction when it deletes the very passages that substantiate this understanding of Bolingbroke's character, intent, and reason for final ascent to the throne of England. The editing of these lines renders the adaptation less complex and at the same time less faithful to the original version as conceived by Shakespeare.

The remaining portion of the original IV.i (lines 107-320) is substantially the same in the television version. Richard's poetic character and Bolingbroke's rather prosaic, non-committal manner are retained almost in their entirety.

The next scene, TV-III.ii, is built from the original III.iv and V.i. Both take place in the Queen's garden; the first scene involves the gardeners and the Queen, while the later scene brings Richard to the Queen on his way to prison. To simplify the movement of the play, possibly, and to keep the play moving progressively forward, the adaptors have welded the two scenes into one on television. From the first scene (III.iv) only twenty-two lines of the original seventy-two line portion are used in the adaptation; there follows V.i (lines 7-8, 16-102); the scene reverts back again then to III.iv (for lines 102-107). In this way the gardeners supply a changed pace as a context encircling the grief-filled action of deposed Richard and the Queen. The IV.i selection is left intact; the III.iv portions are heavily edited. In the editing, the analogue of the State and the Queen's garden is submerged almost

beyond recognition; only a few lines remain which make explicit reference to the garden as a parallel to the State's condition. Television loses the significance of the gardeners' scene as a symbol which concretizes the whole problem of the kingdom and its ills. Instead, the adaptation employs the gardeners more as a lightsome emotional relief (especially when one considers the simpleton-type lines given to the gardener's associate, who speaks in a heavy voice: "Huh? . . . Oh!"; in the original both gardeners have serious lines). The change-of-pace is thus provided; but the deeper meaning of the scene, and its clue to the plot (Richard's decayed government of the realm, and its being replaced by new and sturdy rulers) is lost in the editing.[7]

TV-III.iii is taken from the first part of Shakespeare's V.v: lines 1-41. It is a faithful rendering of the original. At line 41, however, the scene is temporarily disrupted as the television play here melts into the V.iv scene (numbered for television as TV-III.iv); after a few lines taken passim from V.iv--and grossly distorted from their context--the adaptation returns to V.v

---

[7]Tillyard (pp. 249-252) notes that the original "portentous solemnity of the moralising gardeners" had a purpose. Shakespeare was capable of making his gardeners as human and amusing as he wished (cf. King John, earlier than Richard II, incorporating characters like the later gravediggers in Hamlet); but in Richard II he deliberately chose to present them with a degree of formality unequalled in any play he wrote. It is (continues Tillyard) one of the formal, ceremonial features of the play--not merely one of the principal means of expression but the very essence of the play. This purpose is lost in the television adaptation, in so far as the gardeners are rendered somewhat amusing at the expense of their higher function of symbolism and formality.

(numbering it TV-III.v) and continues with lines 67-113. In the transition the television version has accomplished two feats: (1) it has entirely miscast Bolingbroke's character by creating a brief but wholly damaging scene, wherein he overtly pays an associate to murder Richard in prison; (2) it has deleted twenty-six lines of Richard's prison soliloquy, in which he poetizes on the theme of music and time. The adaptation closes the scene at line 113; the original, however, continues on for six more lines, in which Exton (who has murdered Richard) pronounces the dead king to be "As full of valour as of royal blood: Both have I spilt; --O, would the deed were good! . . . this deed is chronicled in Hell." The speech puts a noble epitaph over Richard's lifeless body; it also marks the murder as a foul act. Both of these reflections by Exton underline the theme of the play: the royal problem which was Richard's--his divine right as king in which he reveled to the point of smothering the human being in whom the kingship was invested. The secondary theme (or, better, the external, concrete expression of Richard's interior, personal problem of conflict) of Richard the poet-king vs. Bolingbroke the man and governing king is expressed by Exton in the following line: "This dead King to the living King I'll bear"; again, this highlights the keynote of the entire play. This highlighting has been lost in the editing for television.

Television's last scene, TV-III.vi, is made up of lines 30-52 from the original V.vi. The first lines show the overtaking of the opposing faction by Bolingbroke's men; the only significant loss is

Bolingbroke's note of consideration and respect for nobility and holiness, when he pronounces a mild sentence on his long-time enemy Bishop Carlisle. The final lines of the scene are substantially the same in both versions; in these lines Bolingbroke abhors and berates Exton for his murder of Richard.

Because of the mishandling of V.iv of the original, Bolingbroke's character in this final scene is further misshapened; he appears to be an arch-hypocrite in his protestations against the violent death of Richard.[8]

To sum up: The adaptation follows the basic lines of the original version of Richard II; but it goes irreparably awry in handling the usurpation of the throne by Bolingbroke. His character and his action are indefensible in the adapted text; in the original, on the contrary, his motives and his moves are often quite acceptable and seemingly justified--or, at worst, ambiguous. The main thread of the plot as far as action goes has been severed and retied anew. The central personage of the play, however, Richard II himself, remains entirely faithful to the original portrait

---

[8]Cf. Leon Howard, "Shakespeare for the Family," Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, VIII (Summer 1954), 356-366, for comments on this villainizing of Bolingbroke. The new king became "a vicious hirer of assassins, a hypocrite rather than a penitent" (p. 360); "why should Shakespeare's humanly ambiguous characters . . . have been turned into such artificial fools and villains?" (p. 361). Exton's talk of methods of murder, and Bolingbroke's frank bribing of him to murder Richard were written into the play; "its purpose, I suppose, was to 'clarify' the character of Bolingbroke to even the most stupid member of the audience" (p. 363). But it resulted in a lowering of the level of character interpretation to a point "which offends the intelligence and dramatic sensitivity of a fourteen-year-old boy."

painted by Shakespeare.

The entire deletion of Shakespeare's V.ii and V.iii does not alter the play, although it does affect the characterization of old York and of Bolingbroke. The former's allegiance to whoever is in power regardless of underlying principles or loyalties, is called into question because of this scene; and Bolingbroke's humanity in dealing with York's son, and with York and his wife the Duchess, is also missing from the adapted version. While these losses affect the full delineation of these characters, the deletion of the two scenes does not materially alter the play itself nor the overall character of those involved.

It will be well, at this point, to study more closely the effect of the editing upon each of the characters in Richard II.

THE CHARACTERS IN RICHARD II

A scene-by-scene analysis of the deletions and modifications throughout the play will provide a more detailed comparison of the original Richard II with the television adaptation. An extended table follows which indicates the number of lines spoken by each character in the original version, contrasted with the lines spoken by the same characters in the adaptation. The significant changes thus introduced into the text of the play are noted below in the last column of the table (which column, for the sake of compactness, will be printed alongside and underneath the statistical arrangement of characters' lines for the respective scenes). The

significance of these modifications and editing will be determined by the internal content of the lines, and by their further significance in the overall structure of the play, as pointed out by the commentators and critics.

TABLE III

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant differences
I.i				
Richard	55	47	8	No significant changes
Gaunt	7	7	0	No lines deleted
Bolingbroke	59	38	21	Some few lines of lyric poetry edited (not of importance)
Norfolk (Mowbray)	87	41	46	No significant changes
I.ii				
John of Gaunt	16	0	16	The entire scene is deleted. The importance of Gloucester's death is here pointed up: the king's involvement is more than hinted at (ll.37-41) and the royal prerogative of divine right is pin-pointed; Gaunt's submission to the status quo is made manifest. All of this is lost in deleting the scene. This scene should provide an insight into Richard's character when he later carries out his command of banishment--the punishment of Mowbray and Bolingbroke for complicity in a crime which he himself had ordered. Richard's character is thus doubly blackened by the present scene: he is guilty of Gloucester's death, and later he condemns hypocritically the actions of Mowbray and Bolingbroke. This blackening of Richard's character by I.ii is lost by deleting the scene from the television adaptation.
Duchess of Gloucester	58	0	58	
I.iii				
Surrey (Marshal)	25	0	25	No significant difference (except for loss of the formalities of

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
(I.iii (cont'd)				fighting in the lists)
Aumerle	5	2	3	No significant changes
Norfolk (Mowbray)	52	10	42	Lost is some poetic imagery ("banishment"= loss of native speech--English--from his tongue)
Bolingbroke	78	25	53	No change except for a bit of poetry in a few lines
Richard	69	32	37	The earlier formalities are lost; and in their loss Richard's caprice is modified. In the original, Richard commands the two counter-accusers to determine their respective innocence by formal combat in the lists. After all the preparations for this engagement have been made (I.iii), the combat is all but entered into when Richard suddenly switches his command to a pronouncement of banishment upon both men--one forever, the other for six years. Richard's original attempt to avoid deciding the facts and merits of the case (since, of course, evidence would actually be damaging to himself) gives way to the arbitrary decision afforded by the physical "judgment-by-combat" of the lists. Then, once in the lists--with the combatants just moments from locked conflict--Richard again backs away from a definite (even though inadequate) plan of action; he arbitrarily banishes both, for different terms. And, as a final step of vacillation, he promptly and arbitrarily shortens Bolingbroke's ten-year sentence of exile to a six-year sentence. The entire series of actions shows Richard at his lyric, weakly worst. In the television adaptation the entire lists situation is avoided by having Richard verbally chastise the two counter-accusers, and then he summarily sentences both to banishment (later modifying Bolingbroke's sentence). This now shows Richard capable of passing some judgment on the spot (without procrastinating, to the lists), even though he remains rather arbitrary with Bolingbroke. Lost, therefore, in the adaptation, is some of the vacillation of Richard's purpose and decision.
Gaunt	62	26 1/2 (+2=28 1/2)	35 1/2	(Two new lines are created.) Some of

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
I.iii (cont'd.) Gaunt's adverse reaction to the King's way of handling the combat is lost in the adaptation (ll.222-240); for a moment Gaunt here verbally chastises Richard. A more prolix poetic description of Bolingbroke's enforced exile is lost in editing lines 260-263. Also edited are lines 275-280; in them is repetition of make-believe reasons for exile. In short, the poetic repetition of general ideas is trimmed by editing; but the substance and mood of the character and his part in the drama remain essentially intact.				
I.iv				
Richard	39	35	4	The only deletion is some repetition of general ideas enunciated throughout the speech.)
Aumerle	15	15	0	No changes
Green	5	5	0	No changes
Bushy	2	2	0	No changes
II.i				
Richard	40 1/2	40 1/2	0	No changes
Queen	1	1	0	No changes.
Gaunt	105	57	48	Lost are poetic expressions filling out the idea initially stated (as in ll.7-14). The richness and delicacy of Shakespeare's imagery suffers, as does the fullness of understanding, since ideas are but briefly expressed in epigrammatic lines without the original accompanying expansion of the idea through poetic amplification and repetition. Other lines, however, (as in ll.35-39) amplify the original meaning merely by parallel thoughts and images, and thus tend to slow down the movement of the overall speech; they are themselves rather aphoristic lines and so not quickly understood in their fullness. Therefore, in deleting these latter lines, possible confusion is avoided, and the central idea of Gaunt's speech is closely clung to. Ll.53-56 involved mention of England's "renown for their deeds as far from home . . . as is the sepulchre, in stubborn Jewry, or the world's ransom, blessed Mary's

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
II.i (cont'd.) son"; deleted possibly to avoid offending some members of the mass viewing audience. Again, ll.109-112 are an expansion of the idea summed up in line 113; to delete the earlier lines does not alter the meaning, but it does render the speech more difficult to understand readily since the thoughts are all so telescoped and succinct.				
York	75 1/2	30	45 1/2	In ll.18-28 York had described Richard's adolescent manner of aping fashions and of disregarding counsel; York's condemnation of Richard's immature activity is thus deleted. Furthermore, much of York's outright condemnation of Richard's present action is lost by deleting ll.165-185 wherein York imputes to Richard a series of serious evils, including the death of Gloucester (whose murder occasioned the trial and subsequent banishment of Norfolk and Bolingbroke): "His [your father's] hands were guilty of no kindred's blood, / But bloody with the enemies of his kin." And in ll.213-214, York sums up with "But, by bad courses, may be understood / That their events can never fall out good"; this is certainly an indictment of Richard's actions. All of this is deleted in the adaptation, leaving York's initial position opposite Richard much palliated; and thus York's later coming over to Bolingbroke's point of view is more blameworthy in the adaptation and is branded as strong temporizing (for in the original he had some justifiable grounds for associating himself finally with Bolingbroke).
Northumberland, Willoughby, and Exton (who replaces Ross)	77	36 1/2 (+1-37 1/2)	40 1/2	These lines are divided among the three speakers slightly differently than in the original; there is no significant difference; only an analogy and a list of proper names is deleted (neither important). By intercutting some of the originally longer speeches, the three characters speak less as three separate individuals than as three men growing into one assenting group--all intent on the same thing, all evolving a plan of action against the wasteful King. The effect is one of

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
II.i (cont'd.) more natural speech, and of more excitement and action than provided for in the original, although the words and thoughts are quite the same. Exton replaces Ross in the script, probably to keep the number of characters at a minimum--for simplicity of identification by the audience, and for ease of staging with the television cast.				
II.ii (N.B. The position of this scene in the sequence of the play is different from the original; the scene is composed of segments from other transposed scenes. But the purpose of the present table of analysis is to note the significance of the lines of dialogue themselves and their deletion, rather than their sequential significance. It is true that the delay of this scene does involve a delay of the appearance of the other side of Richard's character--the side to which the Queen refers when she speaks of "sweet Richard," a man capable of inspiring a tender passion. See above, p. 17.				
Queen	37 1/2	15 (+1=16)	22 1/2	Deleted are many of the lines wherein the Queen expresses her premonition of some deep yet hidden grief about to befall; while this foreboding is still present in some of the Queen's remaining speeches, she does not elaborate on the theme at any great length (as she had done in the original). One new line is created for her.
Bushy	31	16 1/2	14 1/2	Bushy joins the Queen in conversation by urging her to forego her sorrowful spirits; he introduces the elaborate analogy of perspectives. Loss of these lines does not alter the basic movement of the scene, although it does remove some of the heavy atmosphere of impending doom which the Queen feels.
Green	21	17	4	The only significance of deletion is in ll. 145-147, in which Green foreshadows the downfall of Richard and

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
II.ii (cont'd.) the defection of York: "Alas, poor Duke! the task he undertakes/ Is numbering sands, and drinking oceans dry: / Where one on his side fights, thousands will fly."				
York	41	21	20	A number of significant lines are deleted in York's speeches. ll.84-85 (speaking of the King and the present uprisings): "Now comes the sick hour that his surfeit made; / Now shall he try his friends that flatter'd him." Again, ll. 100, 102 (York again refers to the King's complicity in Gloucester's murder): "I would to God / The King had cut off my head with my brother's." Finally, ll.111-115 (pointed out earlier in this thesis).
Bagot	11 1/2	6	5	No significant deletions.
Bolingbroke	54	43	11	Lost are ll.70-73: where Bolingbroke demands he be addressed not as Hereford merely, but rather as Lancaster--his proper title. These lines would recall his initial purpose in returning to England: to restore his family rights and titles himself (not to move all the way to the throne of England). However, the editing of these lines does not seriously affect the understanding of Bolingbroke's character and of the drama's plot in general since this same idea is brought out later in ll. 113-114: "As I was banish'd, I was banish'd Hereford; / But as I come, I come for Lancaster," and in the lines which follow (ll. 116-124).
Northumberland	34 1/2	13	21 1/2	Lost are Northumberland's flattering lines which bring out the winning and attractive personality of Bolingbroke; they also poetically describe the countryside. They are deleted in the adaptation (ll.4-18).
Percy	21 1/2	7	14 1/2	No significant changes.
Ross (Exton)	2	2	0	No change, except that Exton speaks Ross' lines.
Willoughby	2	2	0	No change.

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
II.iii.(cont'd.) Berkeley (Percy)	9	3 1/2	5 1/2	This brief sequence has been mentioned: where Bolingbroke's proper title is inadvertently left out and he corrects Berkeley on the point; it is not essential, however, and is supplied elsewhere by other lines with similar import. Percy takes the three-and-one-half lines remaining in the adaptation.
York	47 1/2	37 1/2 (1/2 changed)	9 1/2	A brief pun is lost, ll. 88-89; an historical reference is deleted, ll.100-102. The strength of York's realization of Bolingbroke's return to England is lost in cutting line 109: "In gross rebellion and detested treason" (this is your fault); in ll.143-147 York brings this out again (these latter lines are retained in the television version). Deleted are the lines in which York offers Bolingbroke and his troops a place to rest for the night, which offer Bolingbroke accepts.
II.iv				
Captain	15	0	15	Entire scene deleted. By its deletion is lost (a) a key to the shifting action in the drama, and (b) an insight into Richard, with whom the Welsh captain sympathizes. In the original this scene had a multiple purpose. In Salisbury and the captain is provided a stylized representation of an entire encampment of soldiers waiting in vain for their king to return from Ireland. This provides the audience with a "vantage point"; playgoers now have in their minds the expectation that Richard will land at Wales if he comes back to England. When next the audience sees him in the play, therefore, they will naturally suppose that he is landed at Wales. This short scene also helps create the illusion of much time passing, since Richard has departed for the Irish wars; and, of course, the scene displays the delay of the king coupled with the defection of his troops back home. Subsequent scenes will dramatize widespread desertion of the king's cause by his former followers. Very pragmatically, this scene (II.iv) gives an indication of time-lapse so that
Salisbury	9	0	9	

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
II.iv (cont'd.) Bolingbroke, York, et al. have time to travel from Berkeley (II.iii) to Bristol castle (III.i). These many functions of the scene are lost by its deletion in the television adaptation.				
III.i				
Bolingbroke	38	24 1/2	13 1/2	Lines 9-13 are deleted perhaps because of possible misinterpretation by the mass audience; the meaning is continued in the lines which follow, so no change is made in the overall content of the speech. A concrete list of grievances against Bagot is deleted in ll.22-27; the thought is not changed, but it is weakened and rendered less definite by editing of the lines.
Bushy (Bagot)	2	2	0	No change (except that Bagot takes Bushy's lines).
Green	2	0	2	Green's part is edited from the play.
York	2	2	0	No change.
III.ii				
Richard	145	130 1/2 (+1=131 1/2)	14 1/2	Ll.48-49 deleted, possibly because of reference to the Antipodes (obscure allusion today); the lines are not important. Ll. 172-173 might have been edited because of possible misunderstanding of Richard's true meaning in "Throw away respect, / Tradition, form, and ceremonious duty": his other lines carry the same idea anyway. In ll.211-214 Richard's final command is deleted: "That power I have, discharge; and let them go / To ear the land that hath some hope to grow, / For I have none. Let no man speak again / To alter this, for counsel is but vain." The absolute finality, and the clear-cut frustration and formal renunciation of power and troops is lost by deleting this passage, although line 217 (retained) carries much this same note: "Discharge my followers: let them hence away"; but this occurs in a poetic context--the next line being "From Richard's night to Bolingbroke's fair day"--and is therefore not to be taken

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
III.ii (cont'd.) literally, perhaps.				
Aumerle	12 1/2	12 (+1=13)	1/2	No changes, except for addition of one new line.
Carlisle	14	6 1/2	7 1/2	Lost is a harbinger of what is to be the outcome of the play; deleted are Carlisle's prophetic words (which also give an overt clue to the action of Richard in the play), ll.180-182: "To fear the foe, since fear oppresseth strength,/ Gives, in your weakness, strength unto your foe; / And so your follies fight against yourself."
Salisbury	11	5 (+1=6)	6	Salisbury is a bit over-poetic, to the point of melodramatics, in some of the lines happily deleted: "Today, today, unhappy day, too late, / O'erthrows thy joys, friends, fortune, and thy state"; although the lines *do* state clearly what has happened to Richard's forces and how recently he might have retained them (lost but by a day's delay in Ireland), it seems better that the lines be dropped.
Scroop	36 1/2	22 1/2	14	Scroop's poetic description of the universal position to Richard is lost in the deletion of ll.111-119; some of the poetic ways of speaking may have been misinterpreted by a modern audience (ll.113-115). Ll.194-197 is but an amplification of ll.198-199; their loss is negligable.
III.iii				
Bolingbroke	34	19 1/2	14 1/2	Some poetic expression is lost (ll.33-34). Also deleted are ll.45-48 and ll.51-53; the former express Bolingbroke's deference to King Richard as his sovereign, but the latter express some hint of the possible hidden intent of Bolingbroke to wage war. A case for either interpretation of Bolingbroke's original intent and purpose in returning to

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
III.iii(cont'd.) England--merely to reclaim what was rightfully his, or to usurp the English throne--may be made from each of these passages; in the adaptation they are both omitted.				
Northumberland	28 1/2	17	11 1/2	Cumbersome formalities of referring to lineage are deleted (ll.105-111); no loss, except for ceremonious element.
York	18 1/2	1 1/2	17	Poetic imagery is lost (ll.62-71); Richard is compared to the sun: Richard's fall is like the evening's setting sun. In the final line of the speech is given a clue to Richard's character and to the intrinsic cause of failure: "So fair a show!" This keynote to the conflict and to the entire drama is lost in deleting this whole speech.
Percy	7	0	7	Merely information about who is in the castle; but this information will be known from later speeches anyway, so the deletion has no affect on one's knowledge of the personages involved in the scene.
Aumerle	3	3	0	No change.
Richard	103 1/2	101	2 1/2	No significant change; the significance lies in the speeches' being retained almost in their entirety. Obviously the adaptation is concerned primarily with Richard and his unending self-expression.
III.iv				
Queen	41 1/2	15 1/2	26	These scenes have been greatly modified; many segments of the scenes have been transposed. Among the lines appearing nowhere in the adaptation are ll.24-28 which originally supplied some insight into the gardeners' homily comparing the garden to the affairs of State; the speech prepares the audience for the comparison, whereas without the speech a good

TABLE III (Continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
III.iv (cont'd.) part of the sometimes obscure analogy is lost. Other lines deleted do not significantly affect the plot or the character of the Queen.				
Lady	4 1/2	3 1/2	1	No significant change.
Gardener	50 1/2	21 1/2	29	Much of the detailed explication of the gardeners' analogy is lost;
Servant	9	1	8	

the essence of the scene is preserved, but at the cost of so restricting the detailed comparison that the meaning is hard to divine in the adaptation. The poetic imagery as well as the concrete description suffers from the editing. And in the adaptation the servant is given no lines but the buffoon-type responses "Huh?" and "Oh!" (in a deep voice); his part in forwarding the analogy is lost entirely. The television version uses the scene (1) to pinpoint what has taken place in the drama (and to do so as briefly as possible, with little or no extra poetic or dramatic color or power), and (2) to provide a slight touch of comic relief. Some of the original's touching pathos is lost when 11.100-103 are deleted:

> Queen: Gardener, for telling me this news of woe,
> Pray God the plants thou graft'st may never grow!
> Gardener: Poor Queen! so that thy state might be no worse,
> I would my skill were subject to thy curse.

This scene (III.iv--the Queen's garden) is a "cover scene" which serves a multiple purpose in the original play production. It allows a time lapse for the distance covered from Flint castle to London; it informs the audience of what is going on in the plot by clarifying the play's political import, through the gardeners' allegory; it also offers dramatic emotional relief from the tension of Richard's two greatest scenes personally (as a poet)--his speeches on Flint castle and his tirade at the deposition, which would be less effective if they followed each other consecutively without any change of pace between them. (Note that Margaret Webster believes that the second of the two natural act-pauses occurs prior to this scene; Irwin Smith, on the other hand, feels that the act-pause comes after this garden scene, to provide time to clear the garden set for the entire stage needed for the succeeding Westminster Hall abdication

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
III.iv (cont'd.) scene which, with its crowds and regal throne, clearly calls for the combined stages. Cf. Smith, p. 115, and Appendix I, p. 179.)				
IV.i				
Bolingbroke	36	10 1/2	25 1/2	Ll.86-90 and 103-106: Bolingbroke shows his sense of justice and fairness in dealing with the still-banished Norfolk (who, he learns, has recently died); in deleting these lines, some of the favorable points of Bolingbroke's character are lost. Retained in the adaptation are ll. 155-157 and 271, giving insights into different aspects of his character and purpose: "Fetch hither Richard, that in common view / He may surrender; so we shall proceed / Without suspicion." Bolingbroke's intent is ambiguous in these lines. Does he mean that Richard's outward handing over of the crown will appear to be done willingly? Or does he mean that the deposition is to take place in the open court, lest the people wrongly believe that Richard had been done away with and his throne rudely usurped? Whatever the true understanding of the lines, they remain--with all their human ambiguity--in the television adaptation. In so far as they do have a place, Bolingbroke's character remains true to the original as conceived by Shakespeare. The same is true of l.271 in which Bolingbroke shows concern for Richard's plight under Northumberland's insistent urging: "Urge it no more, my Lord Northumberland." Whether Bolingbroke is genuinely concerned, or only displaying a considerate appearance (for, after all, it was he who commissioned Northumberland to press the deposition papers upon Richard), remains ambiguous in both versions--the original and the television adaptation--and by so much does the play retain its integrity.
Bagot	12 1/2	0	12 1/2	The entire sequence between Bagot, Aumerle, Fitzwater, Percy, the Lord, and Surrey is deleted in the
Aumerle	25 1/2	0	25 1/2	
Fitzwater	22 1/2	0	22 1/2	
Percy	5	0	5	
Lord	5	0	5	

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
IV. i. (cont'd.) Surrey	91/2	0	91/2	television adaptation. Thus is lost the accusations and counter-charges by both groups, relative to Aumerle's causing the murder of Gloucester. This in the original served to demonstrate to Bolingbroke that Norfolk was not guilty as he had originally accused him (I.i). Because of this earlier charge the gages had been thrown down and the subsequent lists had been entered, with the result of Norfolk's permanent exile and Bolingbroke's own temporary banishment. Because of these consequences of the initial accusations between these two, all the rest of the play's action has been brought about. Apparently, therefore, Bolingbroke had been mistaken in accusing Norfolk; but Norfolk had also been wrong in labeling Bolingbroke as "a liar" who had simply concocted the accusation. Both had been correct in their own way; Gloucester had been murdered (but by the King's order, which Norfolk then had to obey); and Bolingbroke made his accusations according to what facts he knew. King Richard had all the while stepped aside from the argument (although he himself was ultimately responsible for Gloucester's murder); he then smothered the entire problem by banishing both accusers from the realm. Richard's arrogant action of grasping Gaunt's (and therefore Bolingbroke's) lands and entire estate was a further injustice. Echoes of all of this involved affair are hinted at, or recalled directly, by the speeches in this portion of IV.i--which have been deleted in the adaptation, thereby rendering the ambiguity and intrigue of the situation less a force in the plot and characterizations. Bolingbroke's actions in the earlier scenes, including his return to England's shores are not justified in the adapted version as they are in the original. Likewise, Aumerle's complicity in the murder is lost by the deletion of these lines. For the purposes of the adaptation this renders the play less involved and the characterization more straightforward--that is, more simply delineated; but this is at the cost of losing fidelity to the original conception of multi-faceted characters. The speeches of the other minor characters are not themselves important (except, of course, in so far as they affect the plot

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
IV.i (cont'd.) as described above); loss of their speeches is not in itself significant in the play as far as characterization goes.				
Carlisle	48 1/2	24 1/2	24	Bishop Carlisle's speech about Norfolk's activities in the Christian crusades is deleted; the references to Jesus Christ and his campaign against the infidels is thereby lost. This may have been too concrete a reference to things spiritual for purposes of the adaptation; e.g.: "And his pure soul unto his captain Christ, / Under whose colours he had fought so long" (ll.99-100). Ll.129-131 are another reference to Christianity; these lines are deleted. Ll.139-141 might be misconstrued by a modern audience; these lines, too, are deleted: Peace shall go to sleep with Turks and infidels, And in this seat of peace tumultuous wars Shall kin with kin and kind with kind confound.
York	10	9 1/2	1/2	No significant change.
Northumberland	14	8 1/2	5 1/2	In the lines deleted he charges Bishop Carlisle with capital treason for arguing against Bolingbroke the new king. This arrest (the Bishop is put in the Lord of Westminster's charge until the day of trial) might be offensive to today's audience, and it would go farther than is necessary for Bolingbroke's ascent to the throne. However, when Bolingbroke later (V.vi.25-29) absolves Carlisle from this arrest, Bolingbroke's manner and character is again shown to be just and considerate. This, too, is lost in the adaptation, which omits both the arrest and the reprieve.
Abbot	9	0	9	In the Abbot's deleted lines mention is made of "the sacrament" and a hint of further developments by way of some sort of plot "to rid the realm of this pernicious blot." But this new plot does not appear anywhere in the play, and so the obscure reference would tend to confuse rather than clarify any sequence of events in the drama. Its deletion is probably to the advantage of the play.

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
IV.i (cont'd.) Richard	147 1/2	123 1/2	24	Richard, as always, loses but few lines.

The lines deleted seem to be only further extensions of the thought and emotion already expressed in other lines. Yet, the deleted lines also carry two elements: (1) a beautiful lyric element, quite worthy of being included in the presentation, and (2) references to the dignity and permanence of vows to God. These two elements occur in 11.191-193, 209-210, 214-215, 235-236, and 244-252. The lyric quality is found especially in the lines last cited; their absence is a definite loss to this scene. In 11.195-200 an extended play on the word "care" is deleted, probably with favorable effect on the play.

This IV.i scene is a great high point of the play. It is marked with long and poetic speeches, dramatic ironies, crucial action (the deposition itself), the occasion for the incarceration of Richard. It is studded with a number of elaborate entrances and exits. (The 1623 Folio edition carefully chronicles the list of personages who enter at the open of the scene: "Enter as to the Parliament, Bullingbroke, Aumerle, Northumberland, Percie, Fitz-Water, Surrey, Carlile, Abbot of Westminster, Herauld, Officers, and Bagot.") Within the scene, York enters attended (1.106) and exits (1.157); "Enter Richard and Yorke and officers bearing regalia" (1.161); an attendant exits (1. 268) and returns with a looking-glass (1.275); Richard is conveyed to the Tower (11.316-318); Bolingbroke and all except the Bishop of Carlisle, the Abbot and Aumerle exeunt (1.320); these last three exeunt (1.334). Thus the full stage was kept busy with stage action and with entrances and exits of single persons, of people accompanied by one or two, and of personages surrounded by entourages. These many entrances and exits lent a ceremonious formality and scope to the stage presentation. On television the ceremony is retained, but the action of stage entrances is replaced by the action of camera movements and angles. Television captures the tone and content of the scene rather well on this score.

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
V.1				
Queen	32	17 1/2	14 1/2	The lines deleted contain a lyrical description of the Tower in which Richard is to be led and imprisoned. The adaptation incorporates this scene into the garden scene; hence the Queen's description of the Tower as she looks upon it would be quite out of place and unnecessary in the adapted version.
Richard	62	49 1/2	12 1/2	Deleted is Richard's urging of his wife to flee to France and join some religious convent there. After condemning Northumberland's part in the conspiracy to unthrone him, Richard sums up in three rather abstract lines what he has just said (ll.66-68); these lines are deleted with no significant loss to the play.
Northumberland	7	7	0	No changes
V.ii				
Duchess	31	0	31	The entire scene is deleted from the adaptation. Lost are: the family side of the York household; the rather humorous interlude of the boots; the damning caprice of York as evinced in his insistence upon loyalty to the new-crowned king, Bolingbroke (York apparently is the fawning type, sidling up to whoever is in power--unmindful of his formal protestations of loyalty to the "rightful" king Richard). Qualifying this condemnation of York's vacillating loyalties would be the lines he speaks (ll.37-40) about Heaven's having "a hand in these events, / To whose high will we bow our calm contents." Of significant loss are ll.23-27, in which York describes the entrance into London of Bolingbroke and Richard; the contrasting picture of the two--the newly crowned and the uncrowned--is a poignant passage; of it Dryden has said, "The painting of this description is so lively, and the words so moving, that I have scarce read anything comparable to it in any other language" (quoted by Hudson, p.142, footnote). This
York	54 1/2	0	54 1/2	
Aumerle	10	0	10	

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATIONS & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
V.ii (cont'd.)				
				powerful description is deleted from the television presentation. Included in the description is a portrait of Richard which was certainly intended to evoke genuine sympathy for the man and sometime king. With the loss of these lines in the adaptation comes the loss of a deeper, more attractive part of Richard's many-fibered character. Aumerle's treasonable note is likewise lost in the deletion of the scene. This scene develops naturally into the following one, which is also edited from the adaptation.
V.iii				
Bolingbroke	51	0	51	The entire scene is deleted. Bolingbroke's references to his "unthrifty son" (Harry, later to become Henry V) is
Aumerle	12 1/2	0	12 1/2	
Percy	6	0	6	
York	26	0	26	
Duchess	44 1/2	0	44 1/2	
				lost; this is significant more for the cycle of history plays than for Richard II itself, except in that Bolingbroke's fatherly concern and care for worthy conduct is manifested in these lines. The scene with the Duchess and old York each supplicating Bolingbroke the king--a scene oscillating between tender pathos and grim humor--is here deleted, possibly with little or no loss to the plot of the overall play. However, Bolingbroke's considerate and forgiving nature is lost in the deletion, as is York's rather inhuman temporizing in pointing out his son as an accomplice in a treasonable plot against the new king. From this scene, perhaps more than from any other, York emerges as a slightly despicable, contemptible character; this scene does not appear in the adaptation, thereby saving York's reputation in the television version. Likewise lost is the second part (with V.i as the first part) of the occasion which might supply a pretext for Bolingbroke's desire to be rid of Richard and his still loyal followers--dangerous to Bolingbroke's position as new king. In the original, V.iv (below) naturally follows upon discovery of the plots in V.iii; in the adaptation, however, V.iv abruptly takes place, with little or no previous logical "build-up."

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
V.iv				
Exton	9 1/2	3 (+10=13)	6 1/2	This scene is subjected to gross interpolation in the television version. In the original Exton merely tells a servant what Bolingbroke seems to have meant by a few obscure words spoken to him earlier. In the adaptation Bolingbroke not only says these words directly to Exton, but there is also no mistake about what is meant; for Exton asks for clarification and Bolingbroke clearly commissions him to do away with Richard. Lest this order be misunderstood by anyone, the adaptors have seen fit to incorporate into the action the handing over of a small bag of gold coins, to finance and expedite the assignment. And the details of the method of murder are more than hinted at by a cold speech of Exton (part of the ten lines created for the television version of Exton). Bolingbroke is introduced into this scene (whereas he did not appear in the original); he is given two-and-one-half lines of Exton's original speeches, plus another four-and-one-half lines newly created for this television version. The heavily rewritten scene (numbered TV-III.iv) follows:
Servant	1 1/2	0	1 1/2	
(Bolingbroke)	0	4 1/2 (+2 1/2=7)	--	

Boling. The commons now begin to pity him!
Have I no friend will rid me of this living fear?
Exton. Meaning the king at Pomfret?
Boling. Exton, I would thou wert the man
That would divorce this terror from my heart.
Exton. Am I not resolute?
Boling. And hast thou cast how to accomplish it?
Exton. You shall not need to give instructions.
'Tis not the first time I have killed a man.
I learned in Naples how to poison flowers;
To strangle with a lawn thrust down the throat;
To pierce the windpipe with a needle's point:
Or whilst one is asleep, to take a quill
And blow a little powder in his ears;
And yet I have a braver way than these.
Boling. What's that?
Exton. Nay, pardon me; None shall know my tricks.

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

Original scene no. and character	Orig. lines	Adapt. lines	Lines edited	Significant difference
V.iv (cont'd.)				
Boling.Here, take this. (GIVES HIM A PURSE) Away! And never see me more.				
Exton. No?				
Boling.No; unless you bring me news of Richard's death.				
Exton. Farewell, my lord.				
V.v				
Richard	85	54	31	Richard loses his lines in one speech mostly, in which he introduces the idea of music; he compares music and time with men's lives; some lyric content of the original is lost in the deletion.
Groom (Gardener)	11 1/2	11 1/2	0	The groom (a gardener, the adapted version) and the keeper retain their lines. Exton loses his lines, which are replaced by the action of pouring some poison over Richard's food before it is brought into the prison cell. In the lines deleted, Exton's encomium on Richard is lost: Exton. As full of valour as of royal blood: Both have I spilt; -- O, would the deed were good! For now the Devil, that told me I did well Says that this deed is chronicled in Hell. (ll.114-117) Since this speech is dropped from the adaptation, the evil nature of the deed--the murder of a king--is not underlined. After the interpolations of the previous scene, this speech would seem entirely out of keeping with Exton's blackened character, and so would naturally have to be deleted.
Keeper	5	5	0	
Exton	6	0	6	
V.vi				
Bolingbroke	33	14	19	In this the final scene of the play, the television adaptors have condensed the action to include only Bolingbroke's excoriation of the murder of Richard; this
Northumberland	5	0	5	
Fitzwater	4	0	4	
Percy	5	0	5	
Exton	5	5	0	

TABLE III (continued)

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT OF LINES
(AFFECTING CHARACTERIZATION & PLOT)

V.vi.(cont'd.)
dénouement, in the light of the rewritten V.iv, is the personification of hypocrisy on Bolingbroke's part. Exton's defense of his deed (1.38)--"From your own mouth, my lord, did I this deed"--is literally correct only in the adapted version; in the original Exton presumed to understand what Bolingbroke merely sighed about in an indirect, confidential manner (far from the overt command portrayed in the revised production).

In the adaptation, the reports of Northumberland, Fitzwater, and Percy are deleted; what is lost is their brief accounts of King Bolingbroke's (i.e., "King Henry's") arrest of leaders of factions against his rule. This would have served only to indicate the solidarity of his royal position from this time on.

Lost, too, are Bolingbroke's lines wherein he absolves Bishop Carlisle from the earlier condemnation for arguing treasonably against his (Bolingbroke's) royal self. Bolingbroke, in the typical magnanimous style of an all-powerful ruler, commands him to take himself away--to live in peace, free from strife,

For, though mine enemy thou hast ever been,
High sparks of honour in thee have I seen. (11.28-29)

These lines again reflect something of Bolingbroke's deeper character; they are lost in the adaptation's deletions, as are four lines of grief and mourning for Richard (11.41-42, 49-50).

From the foregoing analysis accompanying the statistical data, it is evident that the television adaptation has modified the original conception of some, but not all, of the characters in this play. Richard retains his lyrical, vacillating character; few of his lines are omitted. Bolingbroke, on the other hand, suffers important revision, particularly in V.iv. As originally conceived, the murder of Richard is presumed by Exton to be the wish of Bolingbroke. In the adaptation, however, Bolingbroke commands Exton to murder Richard; he discusses ways and means for the act;

and he makes payment to Exton with his own hand. Earlier in the play Bolingbroke's character has already been unfavorable modified by the deletion of many parts of scenes in which Bolingbroke manifests a considerate, just mind and heart. In the adaptation his gentler acts are lacking. He becomes a rather strong-willed tyrant or usurper; his better qualities are dimmed by his march to the throne of England.

Such deletions doubly affect the play. They make of the historical figures a defenseless protagonist opposed by a lawless, hardened antagonist. It is the popular two-sided conflict of "the good men vs. the bad men." Smothered is the possible justification of Bolingbroke's attempt to reclaim solely what has been snatched from his rightful possession. This in turn removes some of the emphasis from the fact that Richard merely backs down in the face of remotest opposition and hands over his crown more out of an innate sense of the tragic and poetically dramatic than out of political or military pressures applied against him. Secondly, these deletions affect the pivotal theme of the play--which is not Richard vs. Bolingbroke, but Richard the poet-king (which he is) vs. Richard the man of thought, conviction, and action (which he should be). The latter Richard, it is true, emerges only in the final scenes of the play; nevertheless this is the central conflict about which the drama is built. Richard flounders in his own idyllic fancies just at the time when some definite action is demanded of him. He creates the situation which breeds the possibility of usurpation. He causes the occasion by his shameless prodigality

with the lives, estates, and rights of his subjects. He initiates the climactic conflict by his shabby weakness in the hour demanding positive vigorous action. It is Richard, not Bolingbroke, who makes the first definite move to remove the crown from "unking'd Richard's head." To be sure, Bolingbroke allows the action to continue, but Richard takes it upon himself to play the tear-stained tragic poet-king dethroned by the "untam'd leopards" of his realm.

York's proclivity to indecision is captured in the adaptation, but his extreme fickleness is palliated. His initial loyalty to Richard, followed by his ultimate loyalty to Bolingbroke, is not nearly so prominent in the revised television version. Particularly indicative of this political temporizing are the deleted scenes involving the Duchess, Aumerle, and King Henry (Bolingbroke)--in which York discovers and vigorously denounces his son's treason and demands that the full penalty be laid upon the young man.

The specific modifications introduced into the characterizations in the play are noted above in Table III, in the scene-by-scene analysis. The deletions are more or less significant as discussed above in their respective scenes.

STAGING OF THE PLAY ON TELEVISION

There yet remains an element more difficult to handle in an analysis such as this, but one which affects the overall presentation of the play. This element is the staging employed in the production of Richard II on television. For Shakespeare is not only

the text, but also the visual production of the dramatic work of art. In the theater this involves scenery and properties primarily. In the television production, "staging" will also include the facilities (and limitations) of the television medium.[9]

Among television's specific advantages in this production were the omni-present electronic cameras--capable of taking in various perspectives of the same scene, and able to shift scenes instantaneously. This strongly parallels the original mobility and flexibility of Shakespeare's type of dramatic plot--conceived for the undemanding Elizabethan platform acting—areas rather than for the elaborately designed and immobile stage-sets of latter day theater. Television re-introduces the freedom of movement, of time and of space, characteristic of the Elizabethan stage.[10] The mobility of the television cameras can possibly add to the effectiveness of the play, especially in so far as their movement "is the logical extension of Shakespeare's own technique. His fluid stage permitted him to jump from one part of his story to another. . . . Shakespeare himself probably would be entirely satisfied with this movie [and television] technique, and would have used it had the medium been available in his time."[11] Beyond the multiple acting areas of the Shakespearean stage, the playwright--without any action or movement

---

[9]The basic television facilities considered in this analysis have been outlined above in Chapter III.

[10]Cf. Appendix I, p. 181 of this thesis.

[11]John F. Sullivan, "Teleguide for Richard III," Scholastic Teacher edition of Practical English, XX (February 2, 1956).

whatever--could by mere lyric words, by images of the mind, transform the stage with the speed of language and sound into whatever he willed. (The Prologue to Henry V is the classic expression of this power of aural mobility.) Thus, C.J. Sisson concludes:

> It is easy to realize the principal advantages of such methods of production, namely the supple freedom of scope and rapidity of movement in a drama thus loosed from the bondage of time and space. The drama could rival the epic. It kept a liberty of action which has been regained to-day only in the theatre of the screen, though the revolving stage does what it can to multiply scenes and free action from immobility, in the stage proper.[12]

The question now proposed is: Has this potential of the medium been exploited properly for the Richard II television presentation?

Obviously the movement of the plot was aided by television's peculiar capacity for fluid and instantaneous movement. From palace to Gaunt's home, to coastline, to Queen's chamber, to Bolingbroke's camp, to the coast of Wales, to Berkeley castle, to Bristol, to the Queen's garden, to Westminster Hall, to Pomfret prison, to Westminster again--all of these changes in locale could take place without any scene-waits for a lowered curtain to mask elaborate scenery removal or replacement. Every scene was ready for production at the play's start. The movement of the dramatic action, following the original sequence as outlined earlier, kept up the pace originally conceived by Shakespeare as he wrote for the fast-moving, multi-scened Elizabethan platform stage. On this point

---

[12]C. J. Sisson, "The Theatres and Companies," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison, eds. (New York, 1934), p. 22.

television was certainly an asset.

The close-up technique so natural to television assisted the portrayal of the characters, particularly of Richard himself. By arranging stage movements and camera angles properly, Richard remained close to the camera lens; the play could well be a study of Richard because of intimate camera positions alone. Coupled with the fact that the play is considered by most commentators and critics to be a conflict within Richard himself--the lyric, vacillating king vs. the warm and purposeful man--intimate camera views of Richard are thus most appropriate in conveying the intended insight and impact of the dramatic action.

A fine example of this intimate highlighting of characters is found in the scene at the battlements. While the largest studio set was used for the action--with Northumberland on a horse "on the plain" and Richard far above on the battlement (actually, forty feet high in the N.B.C. television studio)--still, the cameras were most often close in on Richard, with medium shots (from waist up) and with close-up shots of his head-and-shoulders. At the point of parley between the two men, the camera moved in tightly on Richard's profile (an "extreme close-up"), all the while keeping the view through a battlement crenel of Northumberland mounted far below. During the dialogue the camera thus kept Richard in artistic visual prominence. The same visual emphasis upon Richard was apparent in the deposition scene. Always Richard was in the foreground of the picture, while Bolingbroke, Northumberland, and the

bishops were relegated to subordinate background positions on the set.[13] The wide-angle camera lens further emphasized this dominance of Richard; for the lens rendered the foreground object (Richard) very large and clear, as opposed to the illusion of extreme distance which it gave to the background object (even though that object--Bolingbroke and his retainers--be but a few yards behind Richard on the actual set).

Less effective was the television handling of the opening scene in which Richard hears the cause of Norfolk and Bolingbroke and finally renders an arbitrary sentence upon them. For the small television screen there was too much attempt at detail. The already filled screen became further crowded with the many court hangers-on, and the scene became confusing. "In order to encompass the substantial settings, the camera had to be pulled so far back, particularly in the important opening act with its exposition, that a viewer was a spectator, not a participant. It was indeed difficult at times to tell which actor was speaking. Often the screen was so confused and cluttered with people and things that the play itself was obscured."[14] Mr. Gould further comments:

---

[13]Mr. Evans' comment has already been noted: "I think in terms of a twenty-one-inch screen rather than a thirty-two-foot stage." And Rosenberg judges that in the television Richard II "the acting suited the tone of the production; it was competent and controlled. Evans himself did not display that range of anguish that made his stage performance as Richard so memorable; but this was certainly partly from design, from his awareness of how close the audience would be. He knew what he was doing." (p. 174)

[14]Jack Gould, The New York Times, January 31, 1954, sect.2, p. 22.

> The use of dominating scenery may have its place in pedestrian commercial show business where the object is to bedazzle the customer and camouflage the inadequacies of the script. But in theatre of meaning and moment it cannot be the function of scenery to supersede the vital partnership in drama--the relationship between the playwright with something to say and the actor who says it for him. . . .
>
> 'Richard II' showed what television can do, if only television will. Yet it is not to detract from this achievement to suggest that 'Richard II' sacrificed even added power because of its frequent preoccupation with effect rather than substance.

For the production, producer Albert McCleery and director George Schaefer had created twelve sets, including the forty-foot castle walls, large interiors of Westminster Hall, a massive moving barque, and open spaces for the scenes of Richard's return from Ireland and for Bolingbroke's camp, plus many smaller "interior scenes" such as within the tent, the Queen's garden, and the prison at Pomfret. With all of this, the producers had the material to introduce spectacle and scope into the production. But:

> as events turned out, they failed to reckon with the limitations of TV and, more particularly, the difficulty of improving on the priceless assets with which they started--the lines of Shakespeare and the performances of Mr. Evans as Richard, Kent Smith as Bolingbroke, and Frederic Worlock as John of Gaunt. . . . Part of television's great advantage in dealing with Shakespeare is its independence of the proscenium arch and its ability to bring its audience face to face with the players. . . . However, television's producers must not allow the mechanics of the medium to impinge on the contributions of the actor and the playwright, who together put the humanness in drama. Rather than jeopardize these contributions, better a bare stage any time.[15]

That some of the producer's attempts at spectacle and scope was justified, particularly in the first scene, is clear from

---

[15] Ibid.

E. M. W. Tillyard's commentary on Richard II. He takes great pains to show how "of all Shakespeare's plays, Richard II is the most formal and ceremonial."[16] The very actions of the play tend to be symbolic rather than real; they are constructed with elaborate formalities. "In Richard II, with all the emphasis and the point taken out of the action, we are invited, again and again, to dwell on the sheer ceremony of the various situations." For example there is elaborate pomp surrounding the tournament between Bolingbroke and Norfolk (in the television presentation these elaborate formalities came at the throne in the crowded court, as the two men accuse each other before Richard); again, the portentous solemnity of the gardeners; and the unique artifice of Richard's great speeches--all create "the essential medievalism of Richard II. . . . But the 'poetry' of Richard is all part of a world of gorgeous tournaments, conventionally mournful queens, and impossibly sententious gardeners." Since the play has this element woven into its very fabric--the ceremony, elaborate formalities, and elegance of language all

---

[16]This and the following quotations from Tillyard, pp. 245, 251, 257-258. Cf. also A. L. Attwater, "Shakespeare's Sources," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, Harley-Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, eds. (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 219-241. On p. 228 Attwater shows that in his desires for ceremonial effect, in the deposition scene Shakespeare derived the elaborate ritual more from Froissart than from the dejune account of Holinshed. It is interesting to note that critics of the television presentation mention among other extravagances of staging the wolfhounds which Richard (Evans) introduced in the opening scene. But Froissart's history of Richard II mentions a greyhound kept by Richard (cf. Attwater, p. 228). And Benson's Richard at Stratford in 1896 likewise introduced wolfhounds onto the stage--cf. Arthur Colby Sprague, Shakespeare and the Actors: the Stage Business in His Plays (1660-1905) (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), pp. 121-122.

making up Shakespeare's medium of dramatic expression--the television stage formalities and ritual (especially in the first scene and in the Berkeley castle scene on the battlements) is quite justified.

The problem is not altogether that simple to resolve, however. For in re-creating the elaborate scope and spectacle of Shakespeare's Richard II, the producers tangled unsuccessfully with the physical limitation of the television screen (as Mr. Gould criticized). Alice Griffin likewise felt that "the main impression of Richard II was that it was too cluttered, and like the Macbeth it substituted the literal for the imaginative. The setting consisted of an over-abundance of towers and turrets, massive but unconvincing, while the garden set was so filled with flowers and leaves that one had trouble distinguishing the actors."[17] Marvin Rosenberg felt that, except for parts of the opening scene, the Shakespearean elegance was balanced with the medium's demand for clear-cut staging:

> Richard II had a good deal of elegance, but this was mainly kept in hand. Except for some visual confusion in the early court conflict between Mowbray and Bolingbroke, where the director seemed impelled to a certain busyness, the action and background were well controlled. In this second Shakespearean production by Hallmark there were still some tricks that were too obviously tricks--seeing characters through a fire or through the leafy branch of a tree--but these were mercifully few. . . . Interscene action was much smoother. . . . Still, nothing looked phoney.[18]

---

[17]Griffin, p. 64

[18]Rosenberg, p. 174.

It is not easy to determine how much camera work is enough and how much is too much. While Griffin and Webster feel that the electronic cameras should for the most part merely "be on hand" to record the action, Rosenberg and Gassner, with Evans, look to the camera as having a share in the creative development and presentation of the play itself. Of this opinion is Leon Howard, who says of the television Richard II that there were:

> extraordinary technical achievments which characterized the production; but it is significant, I think, that a certain virtuosity of camera work was recognized and admired. Olivier's Hamlet had suffered, as a film, from the exceesive use of actors' devices rather than the resources of the camera as a means of focusing attention upon the main speaker, and the effort to escape this particular influence of the theater was the most encouraging sign Richard II gave of the dramatic potentialities of television. Within the range of my limited knowledge, it marked a great step forward in technique; and the production should be memorable for this if for nothing else.[19]

For example, this was accomplished well in I.i, where Richard pronounces the sentences of banishment; as he finishes speaking, the camera parallels the speech by moving in to an extreme close-up of the writ of banishment which Richard signs. Again, in I.iii where King Richard and his entourage (Aumerle, Bushy, and Green) close the scene by raising a goblet in a mocking toast to the dying Gaunt ("Pray God we may make haste, and come too late"), they raise the goblets to their mouths, the camera moves in fast for an extreme close-up of the raised goblets; then the scene "lap dissolves" from this first image to another similar one. As the second image

---

[19]Howard, p. 362.

becomes clear, we again are looking closely at a goblet, which is then moved away from the camera until we discover that it is a servant who is offering this goblet of medicine to the ailing Gaunt in his home. Thus the camera technique has provided a smooth, artistic, meaningful transition between the scenes; it has effectively bridged the action and has therefore helped to advance the play by the suggestion of change of place and time. Similarly, in TV-III.iii, Richard is alone in the dark Pomfret prison. While seated at a wooden bench with a lone burning candle, he finishes a long soliloquy with: "But, whate'er I be, / Nor I, nor any man that but man is, / With nothing shall be pleased till he be eased / With being nothing . . ." He slumps forward to lay his head on his hands. The camera moves in close until the flickering flame fills the screen; then the picture dissolves into more flames. This time, as the camera pulls back again, Bolingbroke is seen through the flames--they are the burning logs in a fireplace before which Bolingbroke and Exton stand. At the end of this interpolated interlude, the flames again fill the picture and the scene dissolves back to the lone flame of the candle; the camera pulls back once more and Richard starts as he hears a noise at the prison cell door. The result (prescinding both from the distracting "trick shot" through the fireplace and from this one gross rewriting of Shakespeare's play) presents a smooth-flowing continuity from prison to Bolingbroke's room and back to the prison again--with the dancing flame supplying the visual unifying symbol: Richard alone, against the hot machinations of Bolingbroke and his company.

It is to the Hallmark production's credit that camera cutting and movement was restricted to a minimum. During many sequences only one camera covered the scene; from a wide-angled "cover shot" of the set, it moved in slowly on the actor as he spoke. For instance, in the farewell of Gaunt and Bolingbroke, a single camera shot was used almost entirely throughout the scene. Similarly, upon Richard's return from Ireland, one camera carried most of the action (it must be granted that this was a highly mobile overhead "boom" camera). On the other hand, when the players' action and speech were more involved, camera movement and "cutting" were proportionately more involved (as in the fast-paced and elaborate Westminster deposition scene). The increased dynamic pace of the play in this scene was thus mirrored in the frequent "cutting" from one camera to another, visually providing effective pace and rhythm.

At the same time, however, there is the ever-present danger of abusing these assets of the electronic medium. Mr. Howard seems too enamoured of the devices possible in using the medium. On the one hand, he is quite correct in stating that "the technical achievments, to which the production bore witness, make it possible for television to escape the restrictions of the modern stage and restore something of the balance between action and speech which the Elizabethan theater permitted." But he continues: "Actually the balance might be improved by cutting much of the expository dialogue (even when some of it belongs to the star) and by

concentrating more efficiently upon the dramatic action."[20] To this latter statement, the objection immediately arises: is this Shakespeare at his best--especially in a "poetry play" such as Richard II which depends so much for its music and power in the imagery of the words? Mr. Howard's chief objection lies in the deleting of the two scenes between York, his wife, and his son, when the conspiracy is uncovered and subsequently reported to Bolingbroke. In these scenes there is more energetic action, both physical and verbal, and there is an undercurrent of ironic humor; in the latter scene there is also a manifestation of the humanness of Bolingbroke's character. All of this is lost in the television adaptation, and considered absolutely it is a definite fault and loss. But Howard's complaint hinges solely on the action that is thus deleted. His point of view is expressed quite explicitly when he comments: "The motion picture [and television, in this case], as a rule, contains more action and fewer words than does the spoken drama," but Richard was allowed to "talk himself into the firmament. . . . The exciting concluding action of Shakespeare's fifth act, involving the Duke of York and his family, was omitted; whereas very little of Richard's rhetoric was suppressed." If the adaptor's blue pencil is, in Mr. Howard's opinion, to concern itself with the task of "suppressing Richard's rhetoric" in favor of the tit-for-tat action involving York's family, then the works of Shakespeare have little hope for adequate, faithful presentation

[20] Ibid., pp. 363, 362.

on the medium of television. The point is that, while there is much of action in the Bard's plays, it is still the poetic imagery which achieves the impact and emotional power that Shakespeare was trying to create. In the present play, Richard's "rhetoric" is precisely the manifestation of the weak, lyric poet-king who fashions rhetorical epithets when the circumstances call instead for purposeful action on his part. To delete these many lines of soaring verse would be to warp the very essence of the play, Mr. Howard's views notwithstanding.[21]

---

[21]See Howard's concluding comments regarding television adaptations and Shakespeare's balance "of action and talk":

"First, the production should be entirely in the hands of a producer who has complete control of the script, the actors, and the technical resources of the stage and cameras; and he should be a person primarily interested in the new possibilities of television rather than in the traditions of the stage"(pp. 364-365).

"Second, the script should be prepared with more respect for the dramatic talents of the original author than for those of a particular actor. Shakespeare lends himself readily to the expectations of a cinema-conditioned audience, and the balance of action and talk should be preserved regardless of the demands of the star performer" (p. 365).

"Third, a family group might be more sensitive to the subtleties of human relationships than a theatrical audience might be [sic], and an oversimplification or straining of Shakespeare's characterizations could possibly become the major obstacle to the family's acceptance of the drama" (p. 365).

These comments are unique in that they emphasize the medium even at the (seeming) expense of Shakespeare, whereas most critics warn that Shakespeare must be given primary consideration, with the medium supplying its techniques and facilities in whatever way best communicates Shakespeare. Granted that Howard justifies this by appealing to a preservation of the "balance of action and talk" in Shakespeare, still one must seriously redall Miss Webster's warning about the "verbiage" epithet often bestowed upon the spoken word (erroneously) by movie and television producers.

THE PLAY'S POETRY AND IMAGERY

As discussed in Chapter II, much of the play's poetry embodies sustained imagery which is organic to the play's plot and characterizations. The poetic images often provide a definite thread of unity throughout the play; they support the action portraying King Richard's rise and fall, and they render more explicit the manifestation of his character. The imagery thus parallels, and itself even serves to advance, the plot and character development.

Of primary importance in Richard II is the sun imagery. From the twelve passages noted earlier (Chapter II, pp. 66-70), three are deleted in the television adaptation. Two of the deletions affect valuable passages carrying this sun imagery (II.iv.18-24, and III.iii.62-64). Retained are two similarly valuable passages (III.ii.36-53, and IV.i.283-284). The result is that the major portion of this key imagery is retained in the adaptation, so that the integrity of the poetic embodiment of the plot and character development is not seriously modified. And yet, the deletions do deprive the adaptation of two very meaningful and beautiful passages which in the original clarified and highlighted the dramatic structure of the play.

The other important series of images involves the crown motif. These are for the most part retained in their entirety, thus preserving much of the fullness of purposeful imagery created for the play. As always, however, the few deletions are definite losses,

even though not major, to the total effect of King Richard II.

Since most of the imagery in this drama comes from the lips of the poet-king himself, the far greater proportion of the sustained images are intact in the adaptation--favoring, as it does, the many-lined speeches given to Richard in the original. All of Richard's speeches are frought with sustained poetic imagery which carries the structural outline of the play. The imagery provides an aural thread of unity and continuity, as well as providing a depth of character development. Essentially, then, the television adaptation is quite faithful to the original, on the score of sustained imagery.

On the point of adaptation, Frank W. Wadsworth notes that "Shakespeare has not been kept alive to be altered, improved, or drastically abridged. . . . A little trimming they [the plays] can sometimes stand, but as the greatest representatives of Elizabethan drama, a drama noted for its expansiveness, they defy condensation. Television may well in time become a successful medium for their presentation. But to find out for certain it will be necessary for television to grow up to Shakespeare--his stature is too great to be reduced to it."[22] A little trimming is what Richard II underwent for this television presentation. The deletions, and their effect upon the plot and characters, have been noted

---

[22]Frank W. Wadsworth, "Sound and Fury--King Lear on Television," The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, VIII (Summer 1954), pp. 267-268--referring to the Peter Brook-Orson Welles television production of King Lear.

earlier. The reviewers comment: "The play was easier to cut in order to fit into almost two hours' time, and it preserved Shakespeare's basic story and characters. . . . It was good Shakespeare, and good television."[23] "The trimming of the script was well done, and the chief merit of this presentation was its clarity, being far more easy to follow for the new viewer of Shakespeare than was [Orson Welles'] King Lear."[24]

It is worth noting that, to preserve the integrity of the play, the producers demanded a two-hour period of time for the telecast. Margaret Webster has warned, in commenting on Welles' King Lear, that "to produce Shakespeare adequately on television, at least in its present state of development, is much more difficult and much less satisfactory than the making of a motion picture. It means a reduction in terms of time; the attempt to give a reasonable notion of King Lear in seventy-three minutes proved to be absurd, at least when the attempt was governed by the present peculiar orthodoxy of television methods."[25] And yet, Mr. Evans, with the producers for Hallmark, succeeded in capturing a full two-hour period for the presentation of Richard II.[26] This

---

[23]Rosenberg, p. 174.

[24]Griffin, p. 64. As noted in the analytical summary earlier, one of the more mechanical means of achieving clarity was by the simple device of referring always to "Bolingbroke"--changing any references to him as "Henry" or "(Duke of) Hereford."

[25]Webster, pp. 300-301.

[26]In contracting for the Hallmark series, Evans demanded that

more ample time period allowed the adaptors to retain much that is most significant in the play, especially the impressive speeches of Richard.

A brief summary of the present study, together with a few concluding observations, is the matter for the final chapter of this thesis. Such a summary estimate of Evans' television production of Richard II necessarily centers about the modification of the text itself, and includes comments on the techinques of the medium as employed for this production.

---

all shows (adaptations of literary and dramatic classics) be ninety minutes long, except for Shakespeare which would get two hours. He insisted on the minimum hour-and-a-half format because "these potted hour and half-hour versions are so inadequate"--quoted by The New York Times, November 20, 1955, sect. 2, p. 11.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The television play King Richard II was faithful to the original of Shakespeare, in that the drama revolved around, and was dominated by, Richard. Quantitatively he retained most of his original lines. Qualitatively he was accurately represented as the posing, lyric poet-king. But the external element of conflict--providing the occasion for the duel to the death within Richard (who only too late realizes his responsibility and ability to cope with reality)--comes with Bolingbroke's advance through England. The circumstances of this advance--Bolingbroke's ambiguous intent, and his deeper character--were all modified in the television version, presumably for the sake of easy intelligibility on the part of the average viewer in the mass audience. Certainly the modifications were not introduced because of any technical restrictions of the medium itself (due to electronic equipment or technique). In addition to losing some of the artistic integrity of Shakespeare's original conception of the play, by its modifications the adaptation shifted the central conflict from within Richard's poetizing personality and placed it instead on

the merely external "clash" between Richard and Bolingbroke.[1]

The staging of the play on television was for the most part adapted both to the dramatic work being presented and to the medium. The scope and grandeur of the medieval royal situation, plus the more intimate close-range coverage of Richard's words and actions, conveyed much of the original play's mood and content. Close-ups are the forte of television; scope, unfortunately, is not. The larger sets (notably in the opening scene) tended, on the small television screen, to obscure the actors and their movements. The sometimes over-elaborate attempt at realism in the regal sets occasionally defeated itself, since the staging devices employed were so patently unreal (e.g., the huge baroque which so artificially pulled away from "shore" during the York-Bolingbroke farewell; or the fragile mound on which Richard perched when he returned to England from Ireland--it teetered during the speech). Mr. Gould (as noted earlier) excoriates these ambitious but misguided attempts at manufactured splendour:

> One of the curses of contemporary theatre on TV--and off--is the belief that realism, panorama and perspective can be attained better through the handiwork of the carpenter, painter and prop man than through the words of the writer or the artistry of the player.
>
> In blind and literal obeisance to the dictates of the visual age, the most flexible and rewarding of settings--the imagination of the audience--is shunted aside in favor of attempts to reproduce actuality with ten-penny nails, 2 x 4 boards, ready-mix paste, and bric-a-brac from Third Avenue.

---

[1]The word "clash" is enclosed in quotation marks since there is actually no real opposition or clash; Bolingbroke presents the occasion and Richard weakly collapses before him.

> The presentation in many ways was most rewarding TV, thanks to Mr. Evans's inventive and progressive characterization of 'the skipping king.'. . . Yet, it is not to detract from this achievement to suggest that 'Richard II' sacrificed even added power because of its frequent preoccupation with effect rather than substance.[2]

At times the television presentation of Richard II momentarily lost itself in these superfluities of staging and production. On the whole, however, it interwove the staging with the original play's concept and with the demands of the medium.

The final evaluation of the technical tools of the medium--primarily the electronic camera--may come to something like the following. The camera is an integral part of the production; it should be utilized in so far as it highlights and faithfully communicates the proper visual counterpart of the aural art which is Shakespeare. The cameras, and their special devices and techniques must not distract from, nor interfere with, the spoken word by calling attention to themselves. Of primary impertance--the very essence of Shakespearean drama--are the spoken words of the play. These are especially crucial in longer poetic speeches (monologues and soliloquies). Because of the essential role played by spoken words at these intense moments of the play, camera movement (and

---

[2]Jack Gould, The New York Times, January 3, 1954, sect. 2, p. 12. Cf. Rosenberg, pp. 168-169: "Background clutter is poison to complex drama." Cf. also Webster, pp. 300-301: to produce Shakespeare on television "means a reduction in terms of time . . . and of space, and often a waste of the little there is available; tiny figures jostle one another indistinguishably in all the general scenes and are usually, for some reason known only to TV directors, edged off the screen by horses, dogs, and other colorful fauna about whom Shakespeare did not write."

a fortiori unique camera positions and special staging devices) must be kept at a minimum. Every ounce of attention and concentration must be centered upon the speaker and the spoken word. Any attempt to provide "visual variety" or action is artistic suicide. Producers and directors must forego their professional and technical artistic prerogative during these crucial moments of the play, to allow Shakespeare--at these points above all else--to speak entirely for himself. Shakespeare's poetry is not static if the actors' performances anywhere approach the stature of the play, with its inherent beauty and power.

Nor is physical action by the actors essential or even important during many of the major speeches. But certainly an actor's movements during a speech are far more natural and less distracting than camera movement and special shooting devices during the same speech.

In *Richard II* the grossest interpolations on this score were the special "shots" through the fireplace, over the flickering flames, as Gaunt pronounced the moving "This England" speech; and again, in the deposition scene, Richard toyed with the mirror as he spoke his lines, while the camera peered at his reflection in the face of the mirror. In both instances the clever camera positions distracted from the rich lines being uttered.

During a lyric speech, therefore, the camera should not be expected to provide a "visual change of pace" on the pseudo-reasoning that it keeps the poetry from becoming static. If the

poetry is spoken as it ought it will never be static. The function of the camera is not to employ technique which stands out noticeably as technique (which happened a number of times in Richard II); rather, it is to superimpose on the poetry a visual image connected with, not distracting from, the poetry. The special effectiveness of the television medium lies in its power to reduce to physical objects the point of the lyric content and tone. The picture can thus provide a symbolic representation of the core of the poetry. It can also provide visually a pace and rhythm (by its intercutting and camera movement) which corresponds to the pace and rhythm of the spoken word and of the actors' stage movements. The tempo of the content can thus be mirrored in the tempo of the visual means of representation on the screen. Further, the physical image should even advance the meaning of the play by supplying these concrete symbols which can serve as a significant transition bridge from one scene to another.

In summing up the potential of the medium for serious dramatic adaptations, Mr. Rosenberg considers Richard II on television as a valid contribution to the staging of Shakespeare. He carefully notes:

> The plays, since they must be cut, will have to be cut judiciously in order to preserve character, story, and meaning. They must be acted against simple, non-distracting backgrounds that will provide a minimum platform for the lines and the action to emerge in clear outline. The actors must have a knowledge of and respect for the music, significance, and the drama of Shakespeare's language; and they must have a capacity to communicate its essences in the style the intimate new medium demands. Television can do this; and I believe it will.

As with the flexible and intimate Elizabethan theater "the audience then focused on localized action, something the television camera can do now for viewers." Rosenberg has already been quoted for his comment:

> In the close relationship TV establishes, a brilliant clarity can often be given to the music of the verse as well as to its meaning; and the latter can be illuminated by subtle, intimate stage business, legitimately suggested by the lines, that sharpens both the stage action and the characterization. Beyond this, scene can follow scene with the speed Shakespeare was working for.
>
> This is what television <u>can</u> do. In the last year [1953-1954] it came a long way toward learning how to do it.[3]

<u>Richard II</u> as presented on television suffered from a number of minor flaws and errors. Essentially, however, Shakespeare's play retained its basic integrity, and it was even enhanced in some ways by the medium. The technical facilities of this "electronic stage" pose problems which can limit the integrity and total effectiveness of an adaptation of Shakespeare's classics. But, when governed by discretion and a firm conviction of Shakespeare's ultimate superiority over any refinement of medium employed, the electronic process can recapture and even enhance Shakespeare's dramatic art.[4] This was proved in no small degree by Hallmark's television presentation of <u>King Richard II</u>.

---

[3]Rosenberg, pp. 174, 166-167.

[4]Margaret Webster, considering an extrinsic factor, remarks significantly: "It is . . . a sobering thought that on the afternoon <u>Richard II</u> was shown over an American television network it was probably seen by more people than have ever witnessed the play before in the entire world, since the day it was first given at the Globe" (p. 301).

For the modern producer of Shakespeare on television, the responsibility for preserving the fullness of this Shakespearean heritage is overwhelming. He must be certain that the medium grows to the stature of Shakespeare. The medium has shown in this production of Richard II that it not only possesses the potential for communicating the experience that is Shakespeare; it has already effectively exploited much of that potential.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. UNPUBLISHED PRIMARY SOURCES

"Hallmark Hall of Fame: Richard II" television script adaptation. Milberg Productions, Inc. and National Broadcasting Company Television. New York, 1954.

II. PUBLISHED MATERIALS

A. BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Babcock, R. W. "A Preliminary Bibliography of Eighteenth Century Criticism of Shakespeare," Studies in Philology, XXVI N.S. (1929), 58-76.

-----. "A Secondary Bibliography of Eighteenth Century Criticism of Shakespeare," Studies in Philology, XXVI N.S. (1929), 77-87.

B. PRIMARY SOURCES

Shakespeare, William. King Richard II. In William Shakespeare: Major Plays and the Sonnets. Edited by George B. Harrison. New York, 1948.

-----. Shakespeare's King Richard the Second with Introduction, and Notes Explanatory and Critical. Edited by Rev. Henry N. Hudson. Boston, 1879.

-----. Sixteen Plays of Shakespeare. Edited with Notes and Glossaries by George Lyman Kittredge. Boston, 1946.

-----. Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. A Facsimile Edition of the First Folio, with Introduction by Charles Tyler Prouty. Edited by Helen Kokeritz. New Haven, 1954.

-----. King Richard II. The Arden edition, edited and with an Introduction by Peter Ure. London, 1956.

C. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. BOOKS

Adams, Charles. Producing and Directing for Television. New York, 1953.

Adams, John Cranford. The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment. Cambridge, Mass., 1942.

Bretz, Rudolph. Techniques of Television Production. New York, 1953.

Brown, Ivor. Shakespeare. London, 1949.

Chambers, Edmund K. Shakespeare: A Survey. Cambridge, 1926.

-----. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford, 1923.

-----. William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems. 2 vols. Oxford, 1930.

Clark, William George and William Aldis Wright. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare: Stage Edition with a Life, Variorum, Plots, Indices. Vol. XV: Life, Summary, Plots. Philadelphia, n.d.

Craig, Hardin. An Interpretation of Shakespeare. New York, 1948

-----, ed. An Introduction to Shakespeare: Eight Plays, Selected Sonnets. Chicago, 1952.

-----. Shakespeare: A Historical and Critical Study with Annotated Texts of Twenty-one Plays. Chicago, 1931.

Figgis, John Neville. The Divine Right of Kings. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1934.

Gassner, John. The Theatre in Our Times: A Survey of the Men, Materials and Movements in the Modern Theatre. New York, 1954.

-----, and Dudley Nichols, eds. Twenty-five Best Plays of the Modern American Theatre. New York, 1949.

Gervinus, G. G. Shakespeare Commentaries. Trans. F. E. Bunnètt. 2nd ed. London, 1875.

Goddard, Harold C. The Meaning of Shakespeare. Chicago, 1951.

Granville-Barker, Harley G. and George B. Harrison, eds. A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. New York, 1934.

Granville-Barker, Harley G. Prefaces to Shakespeare: First Series. London, 1927.

-----. Prefaces to Shakespeare: Fifth Series--Coriolanus. London, 1948.

Green, Robert S. Television Writing: Theory and Technique. New York, 1952.

Harrison, George Bagshawe and Harley G. Granville-Barker, eds. A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. New York, 1934.

Head, Sydney. Broadcasting in America: A Survey of Radio and Television. New York, 1956.

Hodges, C. Walter. The Globe Restored: A Study of the Elizabethan Theatre. London, 1953.

Hubbell, Richard W. Television Programming and Production. 2nd. ed. New York, 1950.

Hunter, Edwin R. Shakspere and Common Sense. Boston, 1954.

Knight, G. Wilson. The Shakespearian Tempest, with a Chart of Shakespeare's Dramatic Universe. 3rd ed. London, 1953.

Murry, John Middleton. Shakespeare. London, 1948.

Nicoll, Allardyce and Josephine Nicoll, eds. Holinshed's Chronicle as used in Shakespeare's Plays. London, 1927.

Phillips, David C., John M. Grogan, and Earl H. Ryan, eds. Introduction to Radio and Television. New York, 1954.

Ransome, Cyril. Short Studies of Shakespeare's Plots. London, 1890.

Roberts, Edward Barry. Television Writing and Selling. Boston, 1954.

Royal, John F. and Kenneth Royal. Television Production Problems. New York, 1948.

Seipman, Charles A. Radio, Television, and Society. New York, 1950.

Smith, Irwin. Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse: A Modern Reconstruction in Text and Drawings. New York, 1956.

Spencer, Theodore. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. New York, 1949.

Sprague, Arthur Colby. Shakespearian Players and Performances. Cambridge, Mass., 1953.

-----. Shakespeare and the Actors: the Stage Business in His Plays (1660-1905). Cambridge, Mass., 1945.

-----. Shakespeare and the Audience: A Study in the Technique of Exposition. Cambridge, Mass., 1935.

Spurgeon, Caroline F. Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. Cambridge, 1937.

Stasheff, Edward and Rudolph Bretz. The Television Program. New York, 1956.

-----. Television Scripts for Staging and Study. New York, 1953.

Thaler, Alvin. Shakespeare's Silences. Cambridge, Mass. 1929.

Thorndike, Ashley H. Shakespeare's Theatre. New York, 1925.

Tillyard, Eustace Mandeville Wetenhall. Shakespeare's History Plays. New York, 1947.

True, Herbert, ed. TV Dictionary/Handbook for Sponsors. New York, 1951.

Ure, Peter. King Richard II: Arden Edition. London, 1956.

Van Doren, Mark. Shakespeare. New York, 1947.

-----. The Private Reader: Selected Articles and Reviews. New York, 1942.

Webster, Margaret. Shakespeare Without Tears. 2nd ed. Cleveland, 1955. + "Premier" ed. (paperback): New York, 1957.

White, Melvin R. Beginning Television Production. Minneapolis, 1953.

2. ARTICLES IN BOOKS

Attwater, A. L. "Shakespeare's Sources," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, edited by Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 219-241.

Downer, Alan S. "Mr Dangle's Defense: Acting and Stage History," English Institute Essays - 1946: The Critical Significance of Biographical Evidence (New York, 1947), pp. 159-190.

Goodman, Paul. "Philosophic Thought in Richard II," The Structure of Literature (Chicago, 1954), pp. 59-66.

Granville-Barker, Harley G. "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, edited by Harley G. Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (New York, 1934), pp. 45-87.

Isaacs, J. "Shakespearian Criticism: from Coleridge to the Present Day," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, edited by Harley G. Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 300-304.

Montague, C.E. "F. R. Benson's Richard II," Specimens of English Dramatic Criticism, XVII-XX Centuries, edited by A. C. Ward (Oxford, 1945), pp. 222-230.

Morozov, Mikhail M. "The Individualization of Shakespeare's Characters through Imagery," Shakespeare Survey: II, edited by Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 83-106.

Partridge, A. C. "Shakespeare's Orthography in Venus and Adonis and Some Early Quartos," Shakespeare Survey: VII, edited by Allardyce Nicoll (Oxford, 1954), pp. 35-47.

Phelps, W. L. "Shakespeare on the Modern Stage," Twentieth Century Theatre (..., [ca. 1918]), pp. 93-110.

Philbrick, Norman. "Act and Scene Division in the First Edition of Shakespeare," Theatre Annual, 1944, edited by the Theatre Library Association (New York, 1944), pp. 36-46.

Pollard, A. W. "Shakespeare's Text," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, edited by Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 263-286.

Sisson, C.J. "The Theatres and Companies," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, edited by Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (New York, 1934), pp. 9-43.

Van Doren, Mark. "Shakespeare Without Words," The Private Reader: Selected Articles and Reviews (New York, 1942), pp. 200-302.

Willcock, G. D. "Shakespeare and Elizabethan English," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, edited by Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 117-136.

3. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Altick, R. D. "Symphonic Imagery in Richard II," PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LXII (June 1947), 339-365.

Adams, John Cranford. "The Film and Scholarship," The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, VIII (Summer 1954), 340-349.

Bogard, Travis. "Shakespeare's Second Richard," PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LXX (March 1955), 192-209.

Dean, Leonard F. "Richard II: the State and the Image of the Theatre," PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LXVII (March 1952), 211-218.

Doran, Madeleine. "Imagery in 'Richard II' and in 'Henry IV'," The Modern Language Review, XXXVII (April 1942) 113-122.

Draper, John W. "The Character of Richard II," Philological Quarterly, XXI (April 1942), 228-236.

Forsdale, Louis, ed. "Adapting Literary Materials to Television--Part I," The English Journal, XLIV (December 1955), 513-520.

Gould, Jack. "Scenery and Props: A Cluttered Stage May Defeat Realism and Serve to Obscure the Play," The New York Times, January 31, 1954, sect. 2, p. 13.

-----. "TV Only Accentuates Faults of 'The Barretts'," Louisville Courier—Journal, sect. 2, p. 2 (April 3, 1956).

"Grand Entrance," Newsweek, XLVII (April 9, 1956), 104.

Griffin, Alice. "Shakespeare Through the Camera's Eye, 1953-1954," Shakespeare Quarterly, VI (Spring 1955), 63-66.

"Horses, Ships, and Kings," Time, LXIII (February 1, 1954), 59.

Howard, Leon. "Shakespeare for the Family," Quarterly of Film,

Radio, and Television, VIII (Summer 1954), 356-366.

Jones, Claude E. "Imperial Theme--Macbeth on Television," The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, IX (Spring 1955),

Kliger, Samuel. "Sun Imagery in Richard II," Studies in Philology XLV (April 1948), 196-202.

Newsweek. New York, 1956.

Rosenberg, Marvin. "Shakespeare on TV: An Optimistic Survey," The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, IX (Winter 1954), 166-174.

Shepard, Richard F. "Audiences and Acting--Maurice Evans Discusses Ways to Make Television Plays More Appealing," The New York Times, November 20, 1955, sect. 2, p. 11.

Sullivan, John F. "Teleguide for Richard III," Practical English edition of Scholastic Teacher, XX (February 2, 1956).

"Video Rushes in Where Angels Fear," Life, XXXVI (February 8, 1954), 53-54-.

Wadsworth, Frank W. "'Sound and Fury'--King Lear on Television," The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, VIII (Summer 1954), 254-268.

Wilson, J. Dover. "Act and Scene Divisions in the Plays of Shakespeare," Review of English Studies, III (October 1927), 385-397.

III. UNPUBLISHED SECONDARY SOURCES

Becknell, Howard. "Radio Drama, 1935-1945; Television Drama, 1945-1950: A Study of Trends in the Use of Dialogue." Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Indiana, Bloomington, 1951.

Brown, James A., S.J. "The Influence of the Elizabethan Theater Upon Shakespeare's Dramatic Structure of Richard II." Unpublished MS Paper. University of Detroit, Detroit, 1957.

Compton, Joan Buechner. "Acting Technique of Maurice Evans in the Television Production of Richard II." Unpublished Master's Thesis (#7700). Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1955.

Kinman, Marlin Hoge. "A Study of the Adaptation of Novels to the Stage, 1900-1947." Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Indiana, Bloomington, 1948.

Mulhern, Edward Francis, S.J. "The Hamartia of Richard II." Unpublished Master's Thesis. Loyola University, Chicago, 1956.

APPENDIX I

ELIZABETHAN THEATER STRUCTURE, APPEARANCE, AND FACILITIES

Studies of Shakespeare's dramas have discovered a more or less final determination of the structure, appearance, and facilities of the Elizabethan public theater. "As a result, it is now possible to visualize an Elizabethan play in production, and to realize how much of his technique for a man like Shakespeare was governed by the theater for which he wrote, and what effects were possible to him because of it."[1]

More particularly, an analysis of the dramatic structure and sequence of action in Richard II demonstrates the practical employment of the Elizabethan stage, exploiting it for the purpose of dramatic action. Since there were no act-scene waits (except, possibly, two in this particular play), a certain arrangement of the scenes was demanded if the flow of continuous action across the stage was to be sustained. And yet the artistic dramatist exploited these necessities of the physical stage, to help bring about the

---

[1]Alan S. Downer, "Mr. Dangle's Defense: Acting and Stage History," English Institute Essays--1946: The Critical Significance of Biographical Evidence (New York, 1947), p. 164.

organic whole which is his work of dramatic art. The structure of Richard II is proof "of the dramatist's concern to avoid a break in the action";[2] whereas "mere continuity is easily contrived, it is not so easy to give it significance and dramatic value. . . . From start to finish there is no sense of pause."[3] In Richard II the minimum number of acting areas demanded by the action can be ascertained. They are: a main stage or plarform; a recessed inner stage on the first level; an entrance-exit door to both the left and the right of the stage; a balcony gallery; an interior acting area or "chamber" on this second level. Other areas not specifically demanded by the action in this play can be determined by a similar study of scene-sequence and action in other Shakespearean dramas.[4]

Dr. John Cranford Adams summarizes his findings relative to the Elizabethan stage:

> To make Shakespeare's dramatic techniques comprehensible, the student must know that an Elizabethan stage was designed with seven distinct playing areas fused into one multiple stage; and he should understand how, by means of this stage and the distinctive theatrical conventions of that era, a Shakespearean play could flow in an uninterrupted sequence of episodes upstairs and down as well as forward and back through these seven acting areas. In certain basic techniques the

---

[2]Irwin Smith, Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse: A Modern Reconstruction in Text and Drawing (New York, 1956), p. 115.

[3]Harley Granville-Barker, "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, ed. Harley Granville-Barker and George B. Harrison (New York, 1934), pp. 64, 65.

[4]Cf. also unpublished MS paper by this author: "The Influence of the Elizabethan Theater upon Shakespeare's Dramatic Structure of Richard II" (University of Detroit, 1957)--for details of analysis and for a more complete bibliography.

> Elizabethan drama is closer to motion pictures of today than to modern theatre productions. The continuous flow of action, the surging movement--supporting with theatrical logic the rapid turn of events--and the almost limitless power to vary the scene--to take the plays indoors and out, upstairs, downstairs, in my lady's chamber--as best suited the plot: all these lie hidden in an Elizabethan play unless the student knows something of the stage for which the play was designed and something of the conventions which govern and distinguish Elizabethan drama. . . . Shakespeare employed the multiple stage to achieve variety, fluidity, and an unbroken flow of action.[5]

Irwin Smith concurs, and further amplifies the description given by Adams:

> Each inner stage could be used alone or in combination with other stage units. Each could be disclosed to view, after having been set in advance with distinctive properties and scenic hangings, closed when the action moved elsewhere, refurnished with new properties and hangings behind closed curtains, and revealed again later as a different location. Herein lay the means by which the Shakespearean drama achieved its uninterrupted flow of action: when one group of actors brought a scene or sequence to its end in one stage unit, another group stood ready to pick up the action without a pause in another unit; 'the click of the completed rhyme of an exit tag was still audible, perhaps, as a new group took up the discourse.' There was, of course, no such regular alternation of scenes, as between platform and a single inner stage, as was envisioned by the proponents of the now-discarded Alternation Theory, but there was the platform and some other unit or units of the multiple stage, which permitted each scene or sequence to be played on an appropriate stage unit and with suitable properties and trappings if need should be. The result was a continuity and pace found today only in motion pictures.[6]

---

[5]John Cranford Adams, "The Film and Scholarship," The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television, VIII (Summer 1954), pp. 340, 342. This is an informal review of the educational film "Shakespeare's Theatre: The Globe Playhouse"--a doctoral research project at the University of California, by William E. and Mildred R. Jordan.

[6]Smith, p. 97.

C. J. Sisson agrees with the findings and speculative conclusions of Adams and Smith; Margaret Webster favors much the same reconstruction of the Elizabethan stage and production manner. Opposed to these theories (based on available data) is C. Walter Hodges. But he does accept the outer stage and curtain on the first level, with some sort of area behind the curtain (used only for parts of small scenes, or for properties which were to be thrust forward through the curtain and out onto the outer stage at the proper moments in the play); he also allows a second and a third balcony or "gallery acting area," although he will not accept the theory that these galleries were backed by curtains which could be opened to reveal an inner stage. He agrees with Adams and Smith and other scholars that there were two doors on the main stage level, one at either side for entrances and exits and to represent various places called for by the drama; above these doors there were two windows in which dramatic action could take place--either in conjunction with the action on the main stage (as in the balcony scene in Romeo and Juliet--thus Adam's positioning of this scene) or by itself (as for a soliloquy in one's upper chamber, apart from the "chamber" proper behind the curtained upper stage balcony which would be used only for major action).[7]

---

[7]Cf. C. Walter Hodges, The Globe Restored: A Study of the Elizabethan Theatre (London, 1953), pp. 21, 25, 28-31, 53-56; C. J. Sisson, "The Theater and Companies," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, pp. 22, 24-25, 30; Arthur Colby Sprague, Shakespeare and the Actors: the Stage Business in His Plays (1660-1905) (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), p. 13; Homer A. Watt et al., Outlines of Shakespeare's

The plays themselves--their internal dramatic structure--and historical discoveries of Elizabethan architecture, theater conventions, etc., supply evidence for determining (in a provisional way, at least) the construction of the physical theater for which Shakespeare wrote. The physical theater influenced the playwright's conception of his dramatic work. For a full understanding of a play--of its conception and execution--one must therefore know both the play itself and the theater stage for which it was originally written.

Plays (New York, 1956), pp. 7-8; George B. Harrison, ed., Shakespeare: Major Plays and Sonnets (New York, 1948), pp. 55-56, where in his General Introduction he follows John Cranford Adams with approval.

APPENDIX II

GLOSSARY OF BASIC TELEVISION PRODUCTION TERMS EMPLOYED IN THESIS

boom -- Crane-like device for suspending microphone or camera in midair and moving it from one position to another during the television production.

cable-pullers -- Studio assistants who keep the coiling camera cables out of the cameras' paths during the process of production in the studio; they also serve as assistants to the floor manager, and help to handle the machinery connected with the camera units.

casting -- The procedure of auditioning, evaluating, and selecting the actors who will take the parts of the characters in a television presentation.

close-up -- A relative term describing the distance of the camera lens (and hence viewing screen) from the object being photographed; an inanimate object fills the screen in such a shot; a human being in close-up usually involves the person's head, neck, and the upper portion of his shoulders.

cover scene -- An intervening scene ("B") which allows the talent to change costume or the stagehands to re-arrange scenery from that used in scene "A" to that demanded for scene "C"; the sequence of the scenes in a drama is thus partially determined by the exigencies of physical production.

cue card -- A hand- or machine-printed cardboard sheet on which are written the key words, phrases, or entire lines of speech; the card is held next to the camera lens (if the speaker is addressing the audience) or in the proper line of vision (if the speaker is portraying a character in a drama), so that the speaker can retain the proper phrasing and sequence of speeches.

cut -- Often an order to stop all action or specific action, such

as "stop camera"; in television production it signifies the instantaneous switching of camera picture in-put from one camera to another (as distinguished from the gradual switching used in the dissolve).

defocus -- (also termed out of focus dissolve) Transition achieved by throwing one camera out of focus until the image is unrecognizable, then cutting to the next camera, equally out of focus, and bringing it into focus revealing a new image; used only rarely and for definite special effect.

dissolve -- The overlapping fadeout of one picture and fade-in of another (also termed lap dissolve).

extreme close-up -- A picture taken with the camera lens at very little distance from the object, rendering the object unusually large and clear on the viewing screen; only part of the object is used to fill the screen (e.g., the bottom of a raised goblet, or the clenched fist of a corpse).

fade in; fade out -- The television screen is dark and the picture gradually appears to full brightness; and vice versa, the gradual disappearance of the scene, creating a sense of pause or of finality, generally suggesting the end of a sequence (cf. pp. 82-83 of this thesis).

floor manager (also stage manager) -- The director's link with talent during the production; the floor manager stands out on the floor of the television studio and, under the eye and at the command of the director, supervises production while a program is on the air and relays directions to various personnel.

full shot -- A picture covering the total object, as the entire length of a standing man; this is similar to the cover shot or long shot in which the entire set or the major portion of the acting area is framed within the picture area.

intercutting -- A process of camera shooting, consisting of a succession of very short scenes or--more commonly--of flashes of the same scene from different angles; a staccato effect is achieved visually by the rapid cutting from one camera shot to another and back again.

kinescope (or kine--pronounced with two syllables: "kin-ney") -- A technique developed by Radio Corporation of America to record rather inexpensively on film complete television programs; the programs are filmed directly from the face of a television picture tube (thus all errors in production, timing, etc., are recorded on the film exactly as seen in the original

"live" television presentation).

lap dissolve -- See dissolve.

"live" -- "On-the-spot" televising of events and/or people in contrast to transmission of material previously recorded on film by the traditional movie process or by the modified kinescope process. Similarly, "live" audience refers to the presence of an audience which is actually looking on as a production takes place for instantaneous transmission "on the air."

medium shot -- A relative term signifying the distance of the camera from the object (and hence of the picture content) as midway between a long shot and a close-up shot; for a human being this is equivalent to a waist shot--photographing a man from the waist to a bit over his head.

N.B.C. -- Initials standing for the National Broadcasting Company (radio and/or television, although the latter is usually differentiated by the initials NBC-TV), a subsidiary of the Radio Corporation of America; the radio and television broadcasting "network" of stations in the United States--over which is carried the Hallmark Hall of Fame television series.

network -- Multiple television or radio stations linked by coaxial cables or microwave relay; a coast-to-coast network (of which there are currently three) is a group of stations covering the whole or greater part of the United States.

on the air -- The fact or the process of actual transmission of a program production; what is transpiring before the microphones and cameras is being transmitted and instantaneously received by sets tuned to stations broadcasting the program.

props or properties -- All physical materials used in a scene, i.e. furnishings, decorations, or articles utilized by actors in portraying their respective roles.

rearscreen projection -- The process of illuminating a translucent screen from behind by means of a concentrated beam of light projected through a 3" x 4" glass plate chemically treated to receive and retain a photographic image; at negligable cost a realistic background scene can thus be effected (the bottom and edges of the translucent screen--9' x 12' or larger--are "masked" or hidden by parts of the set or by properties or simply by the restricted picture area covered by a narrow camera shooting angle).

retakes -- Production shooting technique whereby camera shots or scenes are halted and re-shot if errors appear in the original

presentation or production of the scene; this technique is feasible only with the film process of recording; neither kinescope nor "live" production can avail themselves of this freedom for correction.

scene -- (1) A single sequence in a television show which may consist of one or more shots. (2) The setting for the action of a play or situation. (3) A division of an act, play, or show.

screen -- (1) Fluorescent face of the picture tube in a receiver or monitor. (2) A retractable backdrop or wall screen used in conjunction with a projection-type background.

set -- (1) The physical setting viewed by a television camera. (2) A television receiver.

shot -- A single continuous pick-up of the television camera. Cf. also long shot, medium shot, close-up shot, and extreme close-up shot.

soundstage -- A large empty auditorium equipped for production of motion picture or television presentations; the term usually implies no facilities for a "live" audience; the term is used more commonly with reference to the motion picture industry facilities, whose parallel in the television industry is the television studio.

studio -- See soundstage. The television studio may or may not have theater-like seating facilities for a "live" audience.

superimpose -- (also: superimp; super; sup--long "u" sound) -- The overlapping of an image produced by one camera with the image from another camera, both pictures being visible but appearing finally as one picture.

switch (or cut) -- A change from one camera, lens, or camera angle to another.

talent -- Any person to appear on the screen or over the microphone --as opposed to members of the engineering, production, programming, or advertising crews and staffs. (The term is used as a noun, of course, rather than as an adjective.)

telecast -- A television broadcast, program, or show.

televise (or telecast--as verb) -- To transmit a picture electronically by using television equipment.

television -- The transmission and reproduction of a view, scene, image, or person by an apparatus that converts light rays into

electrical impulses in such a manner that those same objects may then be transmitted and reconverted by a receiver into visible light rays forming a picture.

videotape -- A newly devised process of recording a "live" telecast (as with kinescope), but on plastic, magnetized tape rather than on celluloid film; the production process is essentially the same as for kinescope recording, but the electronic and technical process is far superior in speed, quality, and (eventually) in cost; at present (1958) videotape cannot be edited partially, thus temporarily limiting its full potentiality for control of production quality in recorded presentations.

APPENDIX III

PROCEDURE FOLLOWED IN ASSEMBLING MATERIALS FOR THESIS

A duplicate of the original television production script was secured by annotating a standard text of the original play according to the television script in the N.B.C.-Hallmark Hall of Fame production offices in New York. (This was made possible through the cooperation and assistance of Mildred Freed Alberg, executive producer of the Hallmark series, and her Milberg Productions, Incorporated, office staff; the annotations were made by a minute comparison of the two texts--the original and the television version--by Herbert J. Ryan, S.J. and his assistant Raymond Peck.)

This duplicate script supplied the dialogue and major stage and camera directions in written form, as determined upon by the adaptor(s) and the production staff.

Meanwhile the kinescope film recording of the "live" television program was viewed on three different occasions by the author of this thesis. He made: (a) one tape recording of the entire sound track taken directly from the film recording, and (b) one tape recording of his own comments on the entire production according to the visual elements. For the latter, the author

(basing his method exactly upon the method and technique employed in professional television studio control rooms--as observed from personal experience and as found in television textbooks) viewed the film and simultaneously described the camera shots and angles, the "blocking" of the movements by characters, the scene and set designs, the special visual effects. While the author spoke into the recording microphone the sound track was playing simultaneously in the background so that both were recorded on this second single tape; this was done to insure proper coordination of sight and sound--the visual and audio elements making up the production--for further annotation of the copy of the production script.

By checking the duplicate television script against the directly-recorded soundtrack, as well as against the indirectly-recorded soundtrack with the visual "shot-by-shot" description of camera placement, stage movement, properties, etc., the author was thus able to secure an accurate copy of the final television production of the play.

It was this final copy, fully annotated, that was the basis of comparison between the television version and the original Richard II of Shakespeare.

This, then, was the procedure followed in assembling the materials necessary for writing the present thesis.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by **James Anthony Brown, S.J.,**

has been read and approved by three members of the Department of **English.**

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

May 15, 1959
Date

Norman Wayand, S.J.
Signature of Adviser